The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1906.

The Week.

While Congress is wasting time over railway legislation, the day approaches for the going into effect of the new German tariff. In that measure lies a threat of greater injury to American industry than could be caused by a thousand unjust railroad rates. Yet the Administration is sitting down before it helpless. It is not that Germany's coming tariff discriminates against us, but that the absolute control of our Government by the protected interests, combined with President Roosevelt's having paid tariff revision as the price of his phantom railway law, renders it impossible for this country to take advantage of German offers. Germany abounds in good will for us. Her Ambassador at Washington has pressed upon Secretary Root one form of reciprocity treaty after another; but the Senate, where the brute force of our tariff beneficiaries is entrenched, is like a stone wall. Nothing has been done. It is thought nothing can be done. Lodge still has his bogus-jewelry manufactures on his back; the New York Senators are yet ridden by their glove-makers; Penrose and Foraker and Beveridge have each his tariff old man of the sea upon his shoulders; Aldrich remains true to the interests he has sworn to protect, and the Government of the United States is left in the humiliating position of not being able to take a step diplomatically to ward off from its citizens an impending loss of trade.

"His term of service will expire March 3, 1907." Such is the last sentence of the Congressional Directory's sketch of Senator Patterson of Colorado, who last week announced his conversion to the President's Dominican policy. Singularly, the other so-called "White House Democrats" who are counted upon to get the San Domingo treaty through the Senate, are also Senators whose terms of service expire March 3, 1907. Senators have a way of wishing to be reelected. Even Morgan at eighty-one and Pettus at eighty-four say they will seek another term. The term may expire, but Senatorial ambition never does; and the fact of being in good standing at the White House, with a little incidental patronage, is supposed to be a great help in convincing a Legislature that the candidate for reëlection is the man above all others to represent the State in the Senate. Now we are as far as possible from asserting that Senator Patterson's sudden transformation from a violent opponent of President Roosevelt into an ardent supporter has any connection with his own political ambitions. We are for freedom of opinion and disregard of party trammels, and it may be that Mr. Patterson is also, and that he is actuated by the highest motives in breaking with his Democratic colleagues. But he must know that all the Washington gossip is to the contrary; that the common story of the lobbies is that the President is working to win over four or five Democratic Senators by the use of patronage. Consequently, we think Senator Patterson should place his conduct beyond suspicion by showing that not one postmaster or gauger has entered into the forming of his conscientious convictions. To make his disinterestedness as clear as noonday, he might imitate the President in declaring that he will not be a candidate for reëlection.

That the President is using the offices "in order to do business with the Senate," as he expresses it, is unhappily beyond doubt. He is doing it as freely as any more fortunate predecessor —more fortunate in not having been hampered by loud protestations of enmity to the spoils system. One has only to read the columns in the Washington *Star* devoted to the day's events at the White House, to see what is going on. Most of the talk is about scrambling for appointments. "Senator Allee lands his man." "Senator Gamble has had to give up to Senator Kittredge in the fight over the postmastership." "The President has promised Senator Clarke that no internal-revenue collector shall be named without consulting him." And so on. When Representative Overstreet protested against Mr. Roosevelt's giving Senator Beveridge an extra bit of patronage at Indianapolis, he was frankly told that, in the present posture of affairs, it is much more important to placate a Senator than a mere member of the House. Of course, the President is acting from the loftiest motives —that is always understood; but the miserable result is that the public service is being steadily debauched, the spoils employed openly to win votes in Congress, and the broken chains of the bosses welded.

Ingenious friends of the President will need to employ all their most subtle theories to account for his vacillations and final surrender in the matter of rate-fixing legislation. It is now plain that the Senate is to have its way. The Interstate Commerce Commission will not be given power to make railroad rates independently; review and control by the courts will be retained as at present. That is the point for which the best lawyers and clearest-headed men in the Senate have all along contended, and that is the point which the President is now ready to concede. All his loud protests to the contrary were simply playful, it now appears, or fresh illustrations of his "open mind." The clear practical upshot, however, is his tacit abandonment of the campaign he has been waging since his message of 1904. There will be a railway bill. It will contain excellent and needed provisions against rebates and the abuses of private-car lines, etc.; but what Congressman McCall aptly termed "the Presidential non-sequitur" will not be in it. The Commission, that is, will not be empowered to make a rate, to go into effect "at once" without a prior appeal to the courts to determine whether the rate be reasonable and just. In all that matter, we shall stay much as we are. Of course, Mr. Roosevelt will claim a great victory for his ideas, just as he did in the case of the Elkins bill of 1903, which he then declared to be all the railway legislation required; but the facts are not in doubt. The President has retreated. Though assured that he could have the bill he wanted by a combination of Republican and Democratic votes, he shrank before Senator Crane's bogey of a split in his own party which would outlast his term of office. He assents to a rate-making clause which amounts to nothing, and for it has paid the price of giving up tariff revision. A birthright has thus again been sold for a mess of pottage.

But yesterday we had a pretty penpicture from Washington of the two Wisconsin Senators visiting the White House arm in arm, sharing each other's sorrows, sharing each other's joys. So Saturday's news was an extremely unpleasant surprise. The Consul-General at Hongkong, Gen. Bragg, a Wisconsin man, plans to retire; so Senator Spooner recommended a man for the place and saw the nomination transmitted to the Senate, only to have his new colleague invoke Senatorial courtesy and hold up the nomination. Now, Spooner has returned the compliment by holding up a La Follette nomination, and the two are in a fair way to just such a cat-and-dog existence as was predicted for them when the Governor first decided to go to the Senate. The man over whom the dispute has begun is Dr. Amos Parker Wilder, the accomplished editor of the *Wisconsin State Journal*, who was originally a La Follette man and went over to the Stalwart side only after the Governor's refusal to accept the compromise reform bills passed by the Legislature of three years ago. To change sides, even

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the most conscientious motives, and then receive office at the hands of one's new friends, is not a course calculated to increase or retain the esteem of the old. La Follette's supporters would doubtless regard as pusillanimous a concession on such a point.

Apparently, we are to have another great coal strike. The break between operators and miners in the soft-coal fields seems complete; and it may be followed by as absolute a failure to agree in the anthracite regions also. With the demand of the miners for higher wages, it is possible to sympathize. Positively high wages have become relatively low in consequence of the way in which the tariff and Trusts, hiding behind the tariff, have screwed up the cost of the necessaries of life. This increase within five years is admitted by the Bureau of Labor to be about 35 per cent. But it is unfortunately the case that the United Mine Workers propose to add themselves as one more protective monopoly to the many which make hard the lot of the poor. They are demanding higher wages, not for all men who may wish to labor in the mines, but strictly for their own organization, with no wages at all and ostracism and peril for the miner who does not submit in all things to John Mitchell. This is the intolerable part of the Mine Workers' programme, just as it is of the Typographical Union which is now fighting the open shop in this and so many other cities. The rapid rise of employers' associations, like that of Chicago, is the inevitable response to such attacks upon the freedom of labor. In 1903 there were 1,300 strikes in Chicago; owing to the vigorous stand of the employers, and their sharp prosecutions of law-breakers, the number was cut down to 800 in 1904, and the open shop was established in many industries. Unionism which goes to extremes is, in fact, doing more for the open shop than could any amount of abstract arguing.

Thursday's report of the Chamber of Commerce committee on currency reform may be described as highly conservative. It disapproves Secretary Shaw's plan for a 50 per cent. increase in banknote issues, specially taxed so as to prevent their circulation except when needed. The committee's view is that our present circulating medium is probably larger than the country's needs, and that "the excess, if any, only tends to inflation of values." The committee objects particularly to the Secretary's plan of eliminating from such emergency note issues the words "secured by United States bonds deposited." To do this, the committee argues, is objectionable because it would "constitute another form of currency" when we have too many forms already. Pointing out, further, that very nearly half of the existing national banks are only five years old, and have an average capital of only $59,000, the report very plainly declares that such extended powers of note issue "would, under existing currency laws, prove a most hazardous experiment."

In positive recommendation, the committee goes no further than to urge again repeal of the law restricting redemption of banknotes to $3,000,000 monthly, and to renew the Chamber's proposal of 1902, that Treasury surplus moneys, outside of the gold reserve and a proper working balance, should be deposited in bank against other security than that of United States bonds. Again following the report of 1902, the committee advises that not less than 2 per cent. interest be required on such deposits. It is needless to say that we agree with the committee's recommendations. In the matter of the banknote currency, indeed, we think they go by no means far enough. But whether the actual expedients proposed would meet the situation which Mr. Schiff a month ago described as "a disgrace to a civilized country," we confess to entertaining doubts. The committee thinks that, with a charge of 2 per cent. or more on public deposits in the banks, "there probably would result a return in part of such moneys to the Treasury" when, with a prevalent low rate of interest, "such moneys could no longer be used by the banks to advantage." Undoubtedly, such a result would follow in the case of banks which cater to legitimate trade and not to Wall Street speculation. What the policy of banks with a speculative clientèle would be, we can only judge from their policy towards interior bank deposits. Throughout all the 1 and 2 per cent. call-money market of 1904, these banks paid 2 per cent. for the use of such out-of-town balances. We are unable to see why their policy towards Treasury deposits would be different.

For a broad view of the proposed investigation of the State Department of Banking, we commend our readers to the statesmen now indulging in large discourse in Albany. The question at issue, it appears, is not whether Superintendent F. D. Kilburn is managing his office efficiently and honestly, not whether the discovery and correction of possible abuses may safeguard the property of both stockholders and depositors in State banks, not whether the Department is, like the Insurance Department under Francis Hendricks, honeycombed with political corruption. These, it seems, are minor matters, beneath the attention of our exalted legislators. The thing which Senators and Assemblymen want to know is whether an investigation will damage the Republican party. Many of our astute lawmakers seem to fear that, if the lid is once lifted, the revelations of the activity of Republican leaders will be as shocking as those which Mr. Hughes laid bare. Hence the loud cries that Kilburn should resign and thus quiet the clamor for more light. "He should," says one, "have the good sense to retire"; for an investigation of his conduct "may lead to party disaster and financial disaster." Another far-sighted gentleman remarks: "No man who has been honored by his party for so long as Mr. Kilburn has been, should bring about such a dreadful situation." In behalf of some millions of people who are not politicians, but are mere citizens and taxpayers, we beg to observe that Kilburn and Hendricks are nothing but public servants; and the public has a right to demand from then an accounting for their stewardship. If in the course of this accounting some tricky friends of the State administration come to grief, and some thieving bank officers are caught, upright men will have every reason to rejoice.

Justice Joseph M. Deuel declares he will not resign from the Court of Special Sessions. That is, he prefers to be removed under charges. Certainly, he can be under no illusion as to public opinion regarding his connection with *Town Topics*. No one can be found to dissent from the implication of the verdict of the jury, that his conduct has been disgraceful. We presume, then, that the facts brought out in his suit against Norman Hapgood for libel will be presented for action by the Appellate Division. Whatever the decision of that body may be in regard to his violation of the charter by engaging in business, a further point remains for the consideration of District Attorney Jerome: whether Col. William d'Alton Mann and Justice Deuel have not been guilty either of blackmail or extortion. As to their moral delinquency there is no doubt; but moral guilt is not always legal guilt. Yet if Thomas P. Wickes, on the strength of the Jarvis letters, was convicted of blackmail, the evidence against Mann and Deuel would seem to the lay mind overwhelming. Probably there is also other testimony which was not offered in the trial of Mr. Hapgood. Naturally, the District Attorney ought not to proceed against a man unless he is convinced that the case is well grounded. But no verdict is sure until the jury has reported; and a prosecuting officer would accomplish nothing if he waited till every one who was accused pleaded guilty.

What ails the Ohio Legislature when it passes a resolution to investigate Boss

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cox of Cincinnati? It must know in advance, and on the highest authority, that there is nothing but purity and nobility to investigate. In a speech in the House of Representatives on January 18, 1904, Congressman Nicholas Longworth said:

"Then Mr. George Cox is alluded to, a man who, unaided and simply through force of ability and character, built himself up from a poor working boy to be one of Cincinnati's most eminent citizens, a man of whom there is nobody who does not say that his word is as good as his bond. If it is a curse to have citizens like this; if it is a curse to have clean, able, and upright men to administer the affairs of the city, then Cincinnati is indeed cursed."

It is true that Secretary Taft has denounced Cox as a first-class political rogue, but then, Mr. Taft was never sent to Congress by Cox. And is it not something like *lèse-majesté* to refuse to take Congressman Longworth's word for it, and submit the "eminent citizen" of Cincinnati to rude questions about his stealings?

The Cooper Union meeting of protest against suffrage conditions in the South has not received the attention it deserves. It was not a gathering of colored people only; nor was it an isolated and sporadic expression of dissent. The colored people will not sit still and submit to injustice. As they rise in the social scale, their demands for equality as American citizens will surely become more and more insistent. Moreover, as the organization of the Constitutional League which arranged the Cooper Union meeting shows, there are plenty of white people who will stand by them in their battle for their right to participate in the Government. Just at present, the reactionaries of the South and North are having things their own way, as witness the bill introduced in the Virginia Legislature to compel every street-car line in that State to provide "Jim Crow" cars, and the steadfast refusal of the Northern labor unions to permit the negro to learn a trade anywhere, as Mr. Washington has pointed out, but in a penitentiary. But with every year the rise of the negro in material prosperity, and his steady contribution to the wealth and prosperity of the country, will make it more and more preposterous to deny him some of the rights of citizenship because of his color.

In a recent address before the Boston Commercial Club, Prof. Albert Bushnell Hart of Harvard College, who has been making a very careful study of the South, urged that section to drop its insistence upon the negro problem as the dominant issue, and pay some attention to other matters. He pointed out that with one-third of the population of the country, the South furnishes only two-sixteenths of the manufactures, and that this proportion has not increased in the last ten years. The labor problem, the South insists, is at the bottom of the trouble. Yet it makes no systematic effort to uplift the large masses of poor whites and colored people within its boundaries so as to fit them for productive labor. The "poor whites," every whit as shiftless and lazy as the negroes, are ignored, and effort is constantly made to withdraw from the negroes those rewards in the way of citizenship and public esteem and prominence which have been, the world over, an incentive to the laboring classes to struggle upwards. Professor Hart did not, so far as reported, cite Mississippi as a special illustration of his argument. Only 1,500 negroes voted in that State out of a population of 900,000, in the Presidential election of 1904, while not a Republican vote was cast in the Congressional campaign of 1902. Yet the Vardaman gubernatorial campaign of 1903 dealt solely with the race question. With the negro out of politics; with a mixture of the races forbidden; with schooling of the negroes at so low an ebb as to satisfy the worst negro-hater, an efficient State police should solve every other race question, and leave the whites free to advance their State and talk of something else. But no; so long as a politician has his way, the race issue will be kept alive to the exclusion of every other.

Whether Mr. Balfour is to continue to lead the Unionist party is a subject of eager discussion in England. His opportunism has led the party to its most disastrous defeat in two generations, and there is a general desire for a militant chief. That chief Mr. Chamberlain, who still abounds in expressions of loyalty to Mr. Balfour, could probably name if he were not too modest. Yet the matter is not simple. Mr. Balfour, in most trying circumstances, showed remarkable tenacity concerning the Premiership; he may not readily consent to let go the party leadership. Moreover, to make room for Chamberlain would by no means solve the difficulties that beset the Unionists. Mr. Chamberlain is old and in but indifferent health; no party can hope to follow his personal leadership for long. To accept him as a temporary leader would have no sense, except on the theory that his political policies would outlive him and evoke new champions. To this hope the recent election gives no countenance. Whatever may or may not have been the cause of the Unionist catastrophe, it is certain that Imperial tariffs singularly failed in the intention of reinvigorating a party gone stale. And if the country has given no comfort to Mr. Chamberlain's ideas, the protectionists have not produced a propagandist of anything like his force or of any promise as his successor. Accordingly, to change leaders in favor of Chamberlain would provide only for the immediate lean years of Opposition, and it should not be rashly concluded that the Unionists will incontinently turn to Mr. Chamberlain because Mr. Balfour is the most damaged Unionist of all.

Theoretically desirable the separation of Church and State has always been in France. The inequity of the actual law lies in the fact that the Church is, on the whole, more regulated than before. The whole form of parish organization has been changed. Churches become public property, and are leased only at discretion to the newly formed *associations cultuelles*. It is the steps preliminary to this virtual confiscation which have provoked the present disturbances. Furthermore, the endowments to be held by parishes are greatly restricted, and the State constitutes itself judge not only of the loyalty of an association, but of its orthodoxy. Through the abolition of the Concordat, the State sacrifices the right of nominating bishops. It is said that it will endeavor to maintain this prerogative in the absence of a treaty with the Vatican. In fine, the Church is treated as a suspect, whose conduct must be inquired into and regulated with a minuteness hitherto reserved for the unfortunates of the streets. One may deplore the fact that the Catholics of France do not obey the Biblical injunction to turn the other cheek; one can hardly wonder that their bewilderment and indignation occasionally find vent in violence.

Though the League of Leagues has formally condemned the plan for an Imperial Duma, its members are registering for the approaching elections. This, one may fairly hope, means that the revolutionary programme of this powerful order is temporarily in abeyance, and that, while disapproving the election of a merely advisory council, the Leaguers will actually wait to see what recommendations the Duma makes and how far these are adopted by the Czar. For the moment, he has the upper hand. It is of the highest importance not only that the Duma should meet, but that it should be representative, and should arrive at a definite scheme of reform. The danger is that it may fall into the hands of the reactionaries and leave the war of classes just where it is today. Even the revolutionaries need not doubt the power of irresponsible assemblies which are in earnest. The first Zemstvo Congress will not readily be forgotten, though it merely passed a set of resolutions. On all grounds it is to be hoped that the Imperial plan may have a fair trial. From a return to anarchy nothing could be gained, while a responsible parliament made out of whole cloth is hardly conceivable. All sober-minded Russians, then, should hesitate to discredit the Duma.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PARTISANSHIP AND TREATIES.

The pain of Republicans at the sight of the Democratic Senators deciding to make a party question of a treaty is a trifle too ostentatious. Their grief is nominally because of a vicious principle—the injection of the partisan spirit into a question of foreign relations. Treaties ought to be beyond that; they touch the great interest of a continuous policy in foreign affairs, irrespective of party; there is the solemn oath of Senators, etc. But the real woe of the shocked Republicans is that the caucus action of Democratic Senators may defeat their own plans; and at all events their pretence of being shocked is hollow, for they have repeatedly done themselves what they now reproach the Democrats with doing. To their indignant question, When did you ever see us make a party question of a treaty? the true answer is, We never saw you do anything else.

We agree, for our part, that party constraint ought not to be resorted to in order to force Senators to vote against their personal convictions. Nor would we limit this to treaties. The Administration is willing, even desirous, that its San Domingo treaty should be ratified by the aid of Democratic votes; but it starts back in horror at the thought of revising the tariff by the aid of Democratic votes. On general principles, and with an eye solely to the public good, it might well be argued that every Congressman ought to follow his inner persuasion, and not the party whip; but this doctrine falls with a strange sound from Republican lips, even when it is limited to the matter of treaties. If there is to be a great reform, let Messieurs the Republican assassins of treaties commence.

In 1888, they defeated the Bayard-Chamberlain treaty by, as the *Tribune* gloried at the time, "a strict party vote." Every Democratic Senator voted for that treaty; every Republican Senator against it. And there was no concealment about the reasons. It was an Administration treaty in a Presidential year; Mr. Cleveland had been renominated, and the common understanding was, as the *Tribune* reported the English view of it, that "the Republican Opposition could not allow the Administration to get the credit of a great stroke of statesmanship on the eve of the American elections." In the list of Republican Senators of that day who struck hands gleefully to kill a treaty solely because it was negotiated by a Democratic President, are the names of several gentlemen who are to-day so deeply dejected at the baleful exhibition of partisanship by the Democrats.

It is well known, also, that Republican treaties have been forced through the Senate by the severest party pressure. Senator Hoar testified that only by such means was the ratification of the treaty with Spain finally secured. The Panama treaty of Mr. Roosevelt was in like manner made a party measure. Senator Hanna counted noses and reached for votes in its behalf with all the assiduity and skill and unscrupulousness which characterized his management as party chairman. We have heard of a Republican Senator who, when reproached for voting for that treaty, which was intended to legitimize a theft, frankly explained that he was acting under orders from Hanna. Is it, then, merely because the Democrats are acting upon honest convictions that the Republicans are so angry with them?

Ah, but the caucus! The Republicans have never fallen so low as to caucus on a treaty. But that is a dispute about a mere word. It is like Steele's repudiation of the claim of infallibility for the English Church; it was not infallible, it was simply always right. The Republicans in the Senate may not caucus, but they get the practical result just as if they did. This little pretence of theirs to superior virtue was pricked by Senator Teller in open Senate, a couple of years ago. He had been deep in Republican counsels before going over to the Democrats, and therefore spoke the thing he knew when replying to the taunt that the Democrats were more bound by caucus action than the Republican Senators. Mr. Teller dropped into suggestive reminiscences of the time when he was "on the other side," and neatly showed how the iron rule of the "steering committee," with the autocratic powers of Aldrich and Hanna and Allison, backed by the White House, resulted in a tyranny fully as absolute as that of the caucus. A part of what he said was:

> "Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin says they have no caucus. It is barely possible they have a leader on the other side who is so persuasive in his methods that he manages to secure the united body in a way that I will venture to say those who have had a long service in this body never saw the equal of before. In the last two years, or nearly so, there has been upon every question of any consequence, and innumerable questions of no consequence, a united Republican Senate, as we saw it the other day, with one single dissenting voice. Does any one in this country believe that every Senator who voted for that bill on the other side of the Chamber, save the one from California, voted for it willingly, cheerfully, and because of his conscience? Mr. President, we know very well the influence of party upon a vote of that kind."

The plain truth is that this afterthought protest of the Republicans is born of hypocrisy. They condemn in another what they have allowed in themselves.

A strictly non-partisan vote upon the San Domingo treaty the Republican managers would never think of invoking or allowing. They know that it would beat the treaty. It is perfectly understood that several of the ablest Republican Senators are thoroughly dissatisfied with the President's Dominican policy. Left to themselves, they would never think of voting for the treaty. They would not do so last year, much to Mr. Roosevelt's mortification, and some of them, at least, are unwilling to do so this year, even after the hedging and qualifications and explanations which he has made in the effort to placate them. As it is, if the treaty is got through at all, it will be solely to oblige the President and in consequence of party dictation. Yet the dictators are bewailing the abhorrent partisanship of the other fellows!

ELIMINATING ARMY OFFICERS.

Secretary Taft's bill to stimulate the flow of promotions in the army by an annual elimination of some of the least desirable officers in each grade, is the most important of his eleven reform measures transmitted to Congress last week. It is not intended that the number of men to be eliminated shall be fixed outright; the General Staff, which drafted the measure, merely says, for instance, that if the promotions of captains of infantry shall not in a single year reach a given percentage of the whole by reason of the ordinary casualties or retirements of the service, then a board shall be convened to retire the number of majors necessary to advance the required number of captains of infantry to their majorities. In its wording the bill is so technical and involved as to be almost beyond the understanding of a layman, but the principle behind it is clear. The army faces a great stagnation in promotions, owing to the number of young generals in high places and the increase of the army in 1901 by hundreds of young officers very much of an age. In what way shall this stagnation be averted?

President Roosevelt's plan to relieve it was to promote out of order annually a number of worthy officers by a process of selection. In that way, he thought, the brightest officers would be advanced rapidly enough to reach high rank at a period of life when they would still be vigorous and energetic. Although he has urged this plan in two messages, army opinion has almost unanimously rejected it, as is now proved by the substitution of the elimination process in the measure under consideration. Unfortunately for his cause, Mr. Roosevelt himself has been "selecting" officers for advancement to high rank out of order—notably Gens. Wood and Mills—and the result has been intense heart-burnings and dissatisfaction. The army is convinced that this power of advancing officers out of turn can, because of politics, never be intrusted to a Secretary of War, or to a President who has rate-bills and other legislation to advance; they are equally certain that politics and social influence could not be excluded if, as Mr. Roosevelt proposed, the se-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lection were to be made by a board of general officers. Such a board might be overridden by a President precisely as Mr. Roosevelt disregarded the recommendations of the West Point Academic Board and of the General Staff when he foisted upon the Academy a personal friend of the Cuban campaign, Capt. R. L. Howze, as commandant of cadets, in disregard of the wishes of the faculty. Finally, the opponents of selection point out that even if a board could be trusted to promote good men out of order, the resultant jealousies and discouragement of those overslaughed would be injurious to the service. Here, again, Mr. Roosevelt has furnished them with proofs of their contention.

Elimination, therefore, is now suggested in place of selection. On its face, the former is preferable; officers who have opposed the President's plan are enthusiastic over the new one. Undoubtedly, it would cause a normal flow of promotions. Moreover, it would weed out officers afflicted with dry-rot or whose personal failings or habits rendered their early retirement advisable; and by elimination must be understood retirement on a salary commensurate with the length of the service rendered, and not discharge or dismissal. So far so good. Unfortunately, the machinery of elimination must needs be the same as in the case of selection—a board of generals sworn to eliminate in accord with the best interests of the service. To this the first objections will be heard; an elimination board would seem to be open to the same dangerous influences as a selection board. Could it retire—to cite a concrete example—Capt. Pershing, son-in-law of Senator Warren, the mighty chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, if it found Capt. Pershing's retirement desirable? Would it disregard the claims of a son of a chief of staff when the members of the board were looking to his favor for that happy future in the army all officers desire? It is suggestive here to note that when a connection of the President was recently fined in a police court for drunkenness, he was not punished by the military authorities, as were two other similar offenders, and that when he was subsequently branded by an Ohio court as corespondent in a nasty army divorce case, he was allowed to escape merited dismissal by resigning.

At first, of course, elimination would be easy. There is a lot of deadwood, particularly among the hundreds of young officers put into the army in 1901. The misconduct of some of them gave the army an exceptionally bad court-martial record in 1905. Others, whose habits are exemplary, are temperamentally unfitted for the service or are without sufficient education. But if, after a few years of toning up, the elimination board were suddenly called upon to retire 6 of the 45 cavalry majors, it might easily find the choice not only extremely difficult, but in any event certain to terminate ruthlessly the careers of six vigorous, professionally capable men, any one of whom might have in him the latent ability of a Grant or a Sherman. How thoroughly hidden Grant's abilities were when he resigned as a captain in 1854, is a matter of record. And has the Government the right to create a class of able-bodied pensioners capable of giving valuable service?

From several points of view, therefore, the bill is objectionable, although the best of its kind so far produced. The condition of the army in 1898 shows that, even if there is stagnation in promotion, it may be kept essentially sound and have plenty of good men to call on in emergencies. And as Secretary Taft pointed out in his last report, there are several ways in which promotion can be stimulated without a prescribed elimination of given numbers. He asked then for legislation removing any officer who failed in any of the garrison or service schools, and added:

> "In my judgment, one possible and practical solution of the congestion and slowness of promotion that we are certain to have in the Regular Army, is in greater severity in the elimination of those who show themselves *at any stage* in their career unfit to bear the responsibility and enjoy the privileges of wearing the official uniform of the United States Army. This penalty, as applied to lieutenants, it seems to me, should be dismissal; as applied to field officers, it might be made retirement."

That this elimination process might be irrespective of the flow of promotion, is by no means an argument against it.

THE BALANCE SHEET OF CONSCIENCE.

That the last year has been a remarkable one in respect to the growth of "conscience funds" in national, State, and city treasuries, has been reported recently from a variety of sources. Only a few days ago the Philadelphia treasury received the largest donation of this kind in its history; the Treasury Department at Washington had some months before entered next to the largest item in the history of its conscience-book, while the familiar small attempts at restitution have been more than usually frequent. If to the sums thus paid into public treasuries be added those turned back by officers of fiduciary corporations, it is pretty certain that conscience never commanded so high a money value as at present.

The general interest which exists in regard to this curious feature of public finance has been explained on the ground that every human being either has conscience money properly due him, or else ought to pay it himself. At all events, there has been a good deal of speculation as to the causes of the access of *ex-post-facto* honesty. Some say it is due to new standards of militant honesty in public life, and cite the fact that, of the additions made to the Federal conscience fund during the last ten years, more than two-thirds have been recorded since 1901. Others, more cynically, point out that the fluctuations in these returns correspond almost exactly to the succession of good and bad years in business. People listen to inward monitions, according to this view, only when they can easily afford to, and the conscience fund is a more trustworthy barometer of prosperity than the iron trade itself. The effect of religious revivals is also said to be discernible in the older records, though no one puts this forward in explanation of the present activity.

All this could be decided if there were only clues to the motives operating in the individual acts of reparation, but in the majority of cases there are none. The man who has falsified his assessments, smuggled goods through the custom-house, overcharged on an expense account when in public employ, is more than likely merely to put the money in an envelope, write "conscience money" on a slip, and send it to the Treasury. So the majority of items are not merely anonymous, but blind. Those who are brought to repentance through religious feeling are naturally most likely to furnish details, and therefore probably would figure more conspicuously in a compilation of the letters of transmittal than in the entries of the fund itself. The two largest items at Washington, however, were evidently sent in by persons whose soul-searching was due to a religious impulse. In 1896 Consul-General Collins of London sent $14,225.15 which he had received from the Rev. Prebendary Barff, vicar of St. Giles's Church, in a suburb of London. The vicar himself would say only that one of his parishioners had handed him the money with the request that it be sent to the United States Government. This, the largest contribution up to the present time, still remains as mysterious as it was at first. The $12,000 contribution last year, which was in new $50, $100, and $1,000 bills, was accounted for merely by a note which said: "Years ago I defrauded the Government of money, but have returned it all, and now am paying fourfold, in accordance with the teaching of Scripture. The way of the transgressor is hard, and no one but God knows how I have suffered the consequences, and I would seek to do a bountiful restoration. May God pardon, while the United States Government is benefited." The signature "A Sinner" is a favorite one, though "A Penitent" and "A Lost Soul" are common enough to bear out the idea that religion is a frequent motive. A good many sums are forwarded by Roman Catholic priests.

The morbid sensitiveness of some consciences, as revealed in these letters, is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only less extraordinary than the periods for which their pangs have been endured. Stamps are constantly being sent, for instance, to pay arrears of postage which presumably had already been collected from recipients of mail matter years ago. "I enclose a one-cent stamp," wrote a woman, "for having sent a letter with only a one-cent stamp on it, not knowing it was wrong." "Enclosed find nine cents," said a man, "which I wish to refund, as I used cancelled stamps when it cost three cents to send a letter." Two-cent postage was established a generation ago. The people who send these postage stamps never stop to think that the easiest way of making the Government a small present is to buy a stamp of the appropriate denomination and tear it up.

From these the progress is gradual to the actual "freak" donations. "On bill forty-five years old, right party cannot be found," and "For fruit stolen when a boy," are typical of this class. Anything so businesslike as the conduct of the man who drove over from Canada, sold his horse, harness, and buggy, and years later sent, in succession, duty on all three, is rare. Apparently, the still small voice was not silenced by paying duty on the horse alone, so the tormented soul experimented to see if the buggy would not do, and at last, in despair, paid for the harness as well.

Since the first entry, made during Madison's Administration, the conscience fund at Washington—legally only an item of "miscellaneous receipts"—has received between $300,000 and $400,000. This, at present standards, would be enough to run the entire Government establishment for just about four hours; but how it compares with the amount of which the Government has been defrauded in the same time, had better remain unknown for the sake of national self-satisfaction.

THE TRACTION MERGER.

The amazing balance-sheet of the Metropolitan Securities Company published last week, apparently in the interests of the traction merger, must intensify the opposition to that combination on the part of public and shareholder. The expert accountants confessed their inability to arrive at a clear understanding of the actual situation. To analyze the exact status of the "holding company," the "operating company," and the real street-railway company was too much for them, as it has long been beyond the powers of the private investor to obtain any clear idea of this highly complicated financial arrangement. The most important gain from this report is the admission that the Securities company has been paying out large sums to make good the deficits of its subsidiary companies, and that the time when it will earn the guaranteed 7 per cent. dividend on the Metropolitan Street Railway stock is still far distant. As the accountants remark: "The Metropolitan Securities Company will be required to pay out a very large sum of money to make good deficits before it begins to earn a profit on its investment." In addition, there is the grave risk of "additional subway competition, from increased taxation, or from any other source."

Truly, if this is all that the friends of the consolidation can say for it; if this absurdly mixed and almost unintelligible balance-sheet represents the best efforts of those who would present the matter in its most favorable light, the public may well ask what would be left of the proposition after a search-investigation by a Hughes. It is not necessary to agree with an honest contemporary's view that "no other corporation in New York represents such many-sided iniquity," in order to see that in this instance high finance has revealed itself both stupid and shortsighted as well as double-dealing. The one hope for the public approval of such a consolidation lay in an absolutely clear and candid representation of the true situation of the various companies. If its managers had frankly confessed past errors of judgment, had laid bare their real predicament, and had then advocated a merger on the basis of the actual capitalization of the Interurban and the Metropolitan because of the great savings resulting therefrom, the public would at least have accorded them a respectful hearing, and admitted the existence of some sound business reasons for the merger. When, however, the Belmont and Ryan interests, far from suggesting a reorganization on a sound basis, ask the stockholders to take a leap into absolute darkness and insist upon the further watering of an already badly bloated enterprise, their proposal becomes both an offence and a menace. It merits the universal chorus of condemnation with which it has been received.

Bad as is the plan from the point of view of the stockholders, it is, if anything, worse when examined from that of the public. There never was a clearer case of the failure of our great financiers to take warning from the signs of the times. Only by the skin of its teeth was the city saved from a Mayor committed to municipal ownership and management; as it is, there are many who sincerely believe that Mr. Hearst was actually elected. If there was ever a time when the street-railway magnates should have devoted themselves to giving the city a sound and safe management of its transportation lines and to the creation of new roads on the fairest possible terms, it was this year. They should have imitated the Pennsylvania Railroad and taken the public into their confidence. Instead, they have chosen a plan which has strengthened the municipal management propaganda. People to whom this policy is as distasteful as it is to ourselves are openly saying that, as between a stock-jobbing monopoly and street cars run from the City Hall, they prefer the latter. They would not feel so had not Mr. Belmont and his associates deliberately shaken public confidence in themselves and their undertakings. No American financier is strong enough or big enough to urge such a stock-watering proposition without losing prestige and standing. When in addition it appears that the whole transit future of New York is to be in the hands of men so indifferent to the public sentiment and interest, it is perfectly natural that there should be demands for legislative investigations, for laws forbidding the combination. If it is also the demagogue's opportunity, the Interurban and Metropolitan officials have only themselves to blame.

When the future is considered, there is every ground for uneasiness. Is there to be no competition for the enormously valuable franchises which must be awarded within the next four years? None is in sight now, and under existing laws the city cannot become a borrower to the extent necessary to build, much less to operate, the additional lines so urgently needed. Apparently, therefore, the city is bound and delivered to the monopoly about to be created. But if Mr. Belmont and Mr. Ryan think so, and see therein their warrant for getting the surface railroads out of a very bad financial hole by again capitalizing the future of their enterprises, they make a very sad mistake. The people will, sooner or later, assert their rights, even if they have to do it in ways which now seem repugnant. Some of them, who are stockholders in the Metropolitan and Interurban, may begin at once by refusing their assent to an indefensible and iniquitous combination.

ENGLAND'S PERIL.

LONDON, January 25, 1906.

The danger which impends over England is not Home Rule, though the Parliamentary independence of Ireland would in my judgment introduce dualism into the very centre of the Empire. It is not any risk of foreign attack, though England, like all powerful States, has foes enough. It is not the increase of taxation, which, according to many observers, advances with more rapid steps than the wealth of the country. It is not the advent of democracy, which, like a youngster just come of age, is determined to manage its own affairs without much reference to the teaching of experience. The danger which threatens England is the pauperization of the English poor.

The poor-law has always been the weak point of our social system; it has, indeed, from time to time facilitated the maintenance, if not of national harmony, yet of internal peace. Yet it has been a disease sapping the energy and independence

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which are the true foundation of a country's well-being. All the wisest of reformers have felt that this is so. Men as different from one another as Bentham, Chalmers, and O'Connell, men who knew different parts of the United Kingdom, and looked at its inhabitants from very different or opposite points of view, saw that the poor-law threatened the country with evil. The great reform of 1834 was by its authors intended to be much more than a palliative. The diminution and the gradual prohibition of outdoor relief would be, it was thought, the first step towards the total abolition of poor-relief. This expectation has been disappointed. In 1834 it seemed likely enough that pauperism—that is, the existence of a large class depending for its support not on the labor of its members, but on relief, alias charity, doled out by the State—might within thirty or forty years come to an end. There is now no observer, whatever his own political or social faith, who expects that within the next fifty years workhouses and poor rates will be unknown. A man must indeed be an optimist who even expects that the growth of pauperism will, for the present at any rate, be as strictly restrained as it was during the thirty years which followed the reform of 1834. The checks upon the growth of pauperism have all and each of them been weakened, and are likely either to be done away with or to lose their efficacy.

Consider the nature of these restraints, and the way in which their efficacy has been undermined. They were in part external—that is, they were legal arrangements deliberately framed to discourage the lavish granting of poor-relief, and to ensure that the condition of the pauper should always compare unfavorably with the condition of the independent laborer who lived, however hardly, on his own earnings. They were in part internal—in other words, they were opinions or beliefs which, being widely accepted, gave force to the action of the external checks. Of these checks three should be specially noted. The one was the control or direction of the poor-law by a central body which, under whatever name, aimed at curtailing the grant of outdoor relief; the second was the presence on every Board of Guardians of ex-officio members, who, from their position, were more likely to lighten the rates in the interest of the ratepayer than to favor the lavish grant of relief in the supposed interest of the poor. The last was the rule that a pauper could not exercise electoral rights; and that the man who received relief, or expected to receive relief, was not to have the right to determine what relief should be given, and the form in which it should be bestowed. Each one of these checks has been, if not actually removed, certainly rendered more or less ineffective.

Now that the English Government has become democratic, the Local Government Board, the action whereof greatly influences the principles on which poor-relief is distributed, wishes, like every other department of the Government, to gain popularity for the Executive with the electors. It no longer struggles to ensure the rigid enforcement of the principles of 1834. It now and again stimulates the liberality of Guardians, and encourages the idea that any respectable man who is out of work has the right to be relieved in the way least painful to himself. The Poor Law Guardians now may consist of the very class, or at best of men only just above the very class, which may any day require poor-relief, and inclines to think that pauperism is purely a calamity which ought to be relieved in the way least painful to the sufferer. Recent changes in the law itself have gone far to encourage, if not absolutely to necessitate, the granting of outdoor relief to persons who have still resources of their own. The receipt of poor-relief is still incompatible with the exercise of electoral rights, but this salutary rule has been broken in upon by ominous exceptions, and recent provisions for the relief of the unemployed have been so framed as to dissociate the receipt of money, which is in reality poor-relief, from the political disabilities which are still entailed upon a man who is technically a pauper. So much for the external checks. Their increasing weakness is itself a sure sign of the disappearance of the internal check—that is, the condition of opinion which retarded the growth of pauperism and to which alone the external checks owed their efficiency. Pauperism is ceasing to be a disgrace to the pauper; it is held to be the disgrace of the country which allows any man willing to work to be poor.

The causes of this state of public opinion are various, but they are none of them transitory. The Socialism represented by the election of Labor candidates is too natural a phenomenon in an old and wealthy country which has come under the rule of a democracy, to require explanation. The wonder is, not that the English electorate should pursue Socialistic ideals, but that the individualism derived from an older and aristocratic form of government should still exercise important influence. What is really noticeable is, that classes who cannot be numbered with the poor should no longer present a strenuous resistance to proposals which at bottom savor of Communism. The existence of this inertness is certain. Clergymen of the Church of England have hitherto been supposed to be by character and training the supporters of Conservatism. As regards Socialism, at any rate, many of them lean towards innovations which are at bottom more revolutionary than were the principles of the Jacobins, who, however despotic in their actions, were in theory enthusiasts for individual liberty and really respected the rights of property. Hardly two months have passed since the unemployed marched on a Sunday into St. Paul's Cathedral singing the "Marseillaise." They did not come to insult or brave the clergy; they expected to hear a favorite preacher, and, if they did not hear the man of their choice, the preacher for the day was not unsympathetic, and received the occasional applause of his audience. There is something curious in the thought that a sermon congenial to Socialism was delivered in the cathedral where little more than sixty years ago might have been heard a dignified address from Sydney Smith. The wisest, as well as the wittiest, of the canons of St. Paul's was a more effective reformer than any clergyman of to-day, but he would assuredly have delivered to a crowd clamoring for work—that is, for wages at the expense of the State—advice to rely rather on individual energy and self-help than upon any aid doled out to them from the public treasury. Politicians are a very different set of men from the clergy, but the two classes each derive their influence in modern England from sympathy with the wishes of the people. Hence politicians no less than preachers adopt as far as they can the popular ideas of their day. Such action in the case of persons anxious to obtain or to keep seats in Parliament occasionally raises a suspicion of insincerity, and a cynic may note with amusement that zeal for the attainment of objects desired by wage-earners rises almost daily with the increase in the number of Labor representatives who have obtained admission to the House of Commons.

But cynicism here, as in other cases, does not exactly hit the truth. In the excessive sympathy felt or avowed for the sufferings of the poor, there is much less of dishonesty than of self-delusion. The causes which favor sympathetic Socialism are complex. The high value which in the nineteenth century is set upon physical comfort, makes all of us look upon poverty as in itself a greater evil than it seemed even to the most humane of our grandfathers. Englishmen, again, have formed a really juster estimate of the moral harm done to the mass of the people through the lack not only of the comforts, but even of the enjoyments of life. The very conviction, too, on which the poor-law rests, that it is the duty of the State to ensure all its members against starvation, very naturally engenders the conviction among a highly civilized society that it is the duty of the State to see that every citizen, not guilty of crime nor of gross neglect of duty, shall be secured a tolerably comfortable existence. In all these sentiments you have at any rate the conditions necessary for the dominance, even among the wealthy, of Socialistic ideas.

Add to all this the advance of democracy, and then another feeling comes into play, to which thinkers who have concerned themselves with politics have never paid sufficient attention. A sovereign always finds flatterers, and his adulators come to believe seriously in the divinity of their idol. The deification of a Roman Emperor was merely the most striking example of an almost instinctive feeling which exists everywhere and at all times. This feeling is the natural aversion to separate power from goodness. Men know that an autocrat is powerful, they bring themselves to believe that he is wise and good. Wherever the people are sovereign, there with the mass of mankind will grow up the belief that the voice of the people is in some true sense the voice of God. If the English people, or rather the majority of the English electors, come to believe that every man has a right to be supplied with work, and work at fair wages, by the State, a mass of Englishmen, rich as well as poor, will rapidly adopt the faith that the wish of the electors is as wise as it is strong. In 1848 all England, which then meant the £10 householders, and the far wealthier class by which the £10 householders were guided, held the national workshops of France in derision. In 1906 all England, which means the whole body of householders and the class of rich men who know that political power can be retained only by pleas-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing the whole body of householders, leans towards the very principles which brought the national workshops of France into existence. Moreover, the English poor have been for centuries accustomed to rely, in times when work is scarce and wages low, on parochial relief, and the English poor-law is itself a Socialistic institution. Can any one deny that the disastrous extension of poor-relief is in the highest degree probable, and that over England impends the danger of the pauperization of the poor?

AN OBSERVER.

THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE IN FRANCE.

PARIS, December, 1905.

One can but be struck, in conversing with intelligent Frenchmen on the law which is soon to go into effect, with the sadness and even gloom of their views. It is not that they regard the separation of the Church from the State as in itself an evil; on the contrary, the most enlightened of the sincerely religious would rejoice if the clergy were freed from dependence on the Government. Nor is this at all a recent development, for, as long ago as 1830, Lacordaire denounced with fiery eloquence the *budget des cultes*. Between a priest paid by Government and one supported by the contributions of the faithful, he said, there is the same difference as between a mayor named by the State and one chosen by his fellow-citizens. Starvation is better than slavery; it is a pitiful religion that can live only by subventions. Montalembert declared: "We are paid by our enemies, by those who look on us as hypocrites or imbeciles." Even more explicit was Lamennais, who maintained that separation alone could put an end to relations as injurious to the State as to the Church. There is of course an element among the clergy desirous of maintaining the present status, which they find to their advantage; and there are many conservative people, such as one may still find in our own country, who cannot reconcile themselves to a government that ignores God. It is natural for such people to shrink from any disturbance of the established order; but it is not their vague timidities that are impressive.

To understand the melancholy apprehensions to which I refer, it is necessary to consider some of the events of the past. Before the Revolution the clergy was sufficiently dependent on the King; but the King was a good son of the Church. The Revolution, however, made a clean sweep of everything; there existed neither Church nor clergy. The title to the buildings of the Church, with the exception of those that had passed into private hands, became vested in the national and local governments, where it has ever since remained. For political reasons, Bonaparte reëstablished the Church; but it is to be observed that the Concordat speaks of the Catholic religion as that of the great majority of French citizens, not as the religion of the State. In fact, the advantage of situation lay with Pius VII.; but he was timorous, and Bonaparte bullied him into submission. Bonaparte was to nominate the bishops, the Pope merely to confirm them; and the bishops named the curés, subject to the approval of the Government. The consideration for this concession by the Pope was the payment of the clergy, the grant of the free use of the ecclesiastical buildings, and the practical monopoly of the lucrative business of burials. After his custom, Bonaparte altered the Concordat without the consent and in spite of the protest of the Pope, by the Organic Articles, which reduced the Church almost to the condition of a department of the Government. For a century this condition has substantially prevailed, although some of the claims of the Pope were allowed by the Bourbon kings and under the Second Empire, while the subvention of the clergy was considerably increased.

For twenty-five years, however, the tendency has been in the opposite direction. The religious orders were, of course, first attacked. Their teaching was forbidden, their revenues were reduced, and their property has now been practically confiscated. A few of the orders of women devoted to charitable work are tolerated, and, in special cases, teaching is still allowed; but, on the whole, it may be said that the congregations have been suppressed. The turn of the secular clergy soon came. Such exemption from taxation as they had enjoyed was practically terminated, and now the stipulations of the Concordat have been formally repudiated. The older clergy are promised life-pensions, not to exceed 1,500 francs, the rest are pensioned for from four to eight years. The Government proposed to rent the churches for religious purposes for a short term; but the Legislature decided to allow their free use, for the present, while limiting the term during which the other buildings may be used to five years. As to the other possessions of the Church, they pass into the hands of the Government, which is to transfer them, or what is left of them after the process of liquidation is completed, to certain new organizations, called Associations Cultuelles, We are familiar, in New England, with the religious society, as distinguished from the body of church members, and during the Unitarian controversy serious legal complications arose concerning the ownership of church property, the society often being Unitarian while the church remained orthodox. There have been secular organizations in France, called Fabriques, which concerned themselves with the management of the church property. These are abolished, and the new associations are to take their place. The law is so loosely drawn as to make complications inevitable; and as there may be many associations claiming the same property, it is not likely that the churches will hereafter have any considerable endowment. To make sure of this, the amount of endowment which they may accumulate is limited, where their revenue exceeds 5,000 francs, to three times that amount. The financial management of these bodies is subjected to the control of the Government, and whatever possessions they may acquire are to be taxed. Buildings and funds devoted to charitable as distinguished from purely religious purposes are transferred to charitable institutions managed by the Government. With the exception of the grant of the use of the churches, it may be said that henceforth the Government will do nothing for the support of religion. Were it merely a matter of being deprived of revenue, it would be a cheap price to pay for freedom from the corrupting influence of Governmental patronage. The suffering will be severe—it is already acute—but it will be salutary. There is little hope, however, that the Government will cease to regulate the affairs of the Church. The law bristles with difficulties; it leaves for future decision all the most difficult problems. The administration of the law is in the hands of functionaries who hate not only the clergy but the very name of religion. The dispersion by force of 260 religious communities was a proceeding so barbarous that many magistrates resigned rather than participate in it, and it seems probable that all the wealth of these bodies—absurdly overestimated at a million of francs—will be wasted or stolen. The Fabriques were long ago forbidden to receive gifts for the schools of the Church, the priests have been expelled from the management of hospitals and charitable institutions, and in a hundred ways it has been made clear that the separation of the Church does not mean that its persecution is to cease. The attitude of the present Government was foreshadowed in Paul Bert's 'Manuel d'instruction morale et civique': "Dieu est un être qui ne se comprend pas, la religion un préjugé et une superstition que les prêtres exploitent à leur profit, l'athéisme un droit de l'homme, la foi dans le surnaturel incompatible avec le progrès de l'esprit humain."

Is it probable that a Government composed of men very many of whom, if not most, would subscribe to Paul Bert's creed, will allow the hated clergy to conduct the affairs of the Church without further interference? It is not to be expected. Men who cling to the old faith shake their heads sadly, and say, "In France, we do not know what liberty, what freedom of conscience, means." Even a person who might in his heart not altogether disagree with Paul Bert, cannot help sympathizing with these good people. They condemn the iniquities of the clergy, their cruelties, their corruption, their obsequiousness. Even the papal pretensions are commonly ridiculed by the faithful; but they may well feel sore and anxious when they know that they are at the mercy of a set of debased politicians who would gladly extirpate from the nation their most sacred convictions. So far as miracles go, it is only the first step that costs. The good Catholic takes more steps than his Protestant brother, but both of them accept the supernatural. There seems no reason to suppose that the religious instinct is to die out in man; do not the votaries of Christian Science count their millions? Persecution in the name of progress is nothing but a renewal of the infamous policy of the clergy in the dark ages. No good Catholics need expect political preferment, hardly even office, from the present Government; and that means a good deal in France.

At the best, the future of the Church is extremely uncertain; no one can yet tell whether the appointment of the clergy will not fall entirely into the hands of the Pope. If it does, it will be unprecedented if the Government does not interfere; if it does not, Frenchmen must develop a capacity for self-government that they have shown no sign of possessing. Yet it is possible that, out of the turmoil of persecution, of ugly passions and bitter enmities, there may arise a purer religion than any that France has yet known; purer in its clergy, purer in its laity, and eventual-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ly purer in its faith. The elements exist; you may hear homilies to-day that go straight to the heart, delivered by priests who are pure in heart to listeners who are sincerely devout, and at the same time full of intelligence. On the other hand, it is conceivable that the mass of the people may become completely irreligious, the lump being too large for the leaven. No one can foretell the event; but in France whatever happens is at least sure to be interesting. MACG.

THE GOLOVKINS.

PARIS, January 17, 1906.

It will be no easy task to write in future ages the history of Russia. Recent events do not give us a true understanding of the past, as they are themselves difficult to understand. Russia is still as she has been since she was born to history, in a sort of inorganic state; she is agitated by instincts which we are incapable of rightly appreciating; by forces which are not guided by intelligence; by vague aspirations which borrow at times the language of Eastern civilizations, but which hardly know their own aim. In the chaotic state of Russia, history cannot follow the lead of any definite policy; it has for its guide no constitutional laws; its sole resource is to fasten on distinct personalities that appear as lights shining in the darkness.

As a contribution to historical Russian literature, I may cite a volume just edited by Count Fedor Golovkin, under the subtitle of "Le Cour et le Règne de Paul I.: Portraits, Souvenirs et Anecdotes.' M. Bonnet, who writes the Introduction to this volume, tells us that he once saw in the old house at Monnaz, in Switzerland, several portraits representing members of the illustrious family of the Counts Golovkin—the Chancellor of Peter the Great, Count Fedor, Russian Ambassador to Naples, etc. The Chancellor was one of the ancestors of the proprietor of the château of Monnaz, and very valuable relics of the past, as well as the archives of the Counts Golovkin, found asylum in this quiet Swiss residence. They reposed there, unknown to the great public, for nearly a century and a half. Some extracts from these papers were published in 1900 by Lucien Perey in the 'Figures du Temps Passé'; and M. Bonnet gives us the memoirs of Count Fedor Golovkin, preceded by a summary history of his family.

The first Golovkin who appears in the modern history of Russia is Gabriel, a contemporary of Peter I., who became his Chancellor, after having first been a mere chamberlain. He was the first to receive in Russia the foreign title of Count. He often played a part in the orgies of the Tsar, a subject on which we find curious and not very edifying details in the inedited papers of Count Fédor Golovkin. There seems to have been a "council of the best drinkers," of which all the intimate friends of Peter I. were members:

"The rule of these orgies was a promenade round the table of Silenus, and none of the great ones was found more able to play the part than my great-grandfather. . . . These were very rude fashions, but they were not Russian, and caused great scandal in the nation. The Reformer, finding the national drunkenness too vulgar, had it replaced by an exaggeration of old German customs, which his frequenting the booths and drinking-shops had revealed to him, and he regarded such saturnalia as a beginning of civilization."

There is not much to say about the Chancellor's children. The eldest led an obscure life at court. Michael, the younger son, was exiled after the *coup d'état* of the Empress Elizabeth. He stayed in Siberia with his wife a long time, and died there in profound poverty. His body was brought back to Moscow by his wife after Catharine II.'s accession to the throne.

"The Empress gave her four thousand peasants and a pension of four thousand rubles. She was hardly established in her father's house when she lost her eyesight. 'I asked her once,' writes Fedor in his memoirs, 'by what accident?' 'By what accident? Why! I had wept for twenty-three years.' "

She died at the age of a hundred years, remembering to the end in the greatest details the period of Peter the Great. She had conversed with Louis XIV. and Madame de Maintenon in the gardens of Versailles; she had lived in Berlin, in Vienna, on the frontiers of Kamtchatka, in the greatest affluence and the greatest penury.

The second son of the Chancellor of Peter I. was named Alexander; he made diplomacy his career, left Russia and never returned to it, notwithstanding the entreaties and offers of the Empress Catharine. His son Alexander was educated in Holland; he became possessor of the Swiss château at Monnaz, but spent the greater part of his time in a country house near Lausanne—still to be seen as it was inhabited for some time by Voltaire.

"Those were the *beaux jours* of Lausanne. Foreigners came from all sides, such as Gibbon, Voltaire, Servan, Razumovski, Prince Louis of Würtemberg. . . . Gibbon wrote the 'History of the Decline and Fall,' Voltaire organized a theatre, Razumovski was busy with natural history, Prince Louis of Würtemberg founded the Moral Society of Lausanne, an association whose members pledged themselves to mutual enlightenment by conversation and correspondence."

Golovkin lived there; he had married the daughter of Professor Lorenz von Mosheim. Frederick the Great tempted him to come to Berlin, and made him Director of Playhouses. He retained this post only two years and retired to Paris. He was a great admirer of Rousseau, and wrote an anonymous pamphlet, 'My Ideas on the Education of Women, or a Plan of Education for my Daughter.' He died in Paris in 1781. He had for many years kept up a correspondence with Paul I., then a Grand Duke, on philosophical and moral rather than on literary or political subjects. Of this there is unfortunately no trace left. His son George returned to Russia, as he could find no career for himself in France.

Count Fedor, author of the memoirs now published, was born in Holland, and was sent in 1778 to Berlin to be educated. "As the Dowager Countess of Kameke, my father's eldest sister," he says, "kept then the best house in the capital, I had occasion to study at the same time the sciences and the world and a little court—for the Princes of the blood often did her the honor to visit her." He describes in his memoirs the society of the court. Of Frederick the Great he says:

"He hardly leaves the sanctuary of Potsdam except for military manœuvres in various parts of his states. . . . Few travellers obtain the distinction of arriving through a sea of sand at the sanctuary, where genius occupies itself in creating resources where it seems there are none. These rare interviews are granted to celebrity rather than to worth, and partake of curiosity more than of esteem. . . . The great King, either from a superabundant superiority or an irascible pride, often willingly reduces to powder acts and thoughts for which one felt sure at least of a little indulgence. He shows somewhat more leniency to statesmen, but military and especially literary men rarely leave his cabinet without a scratch. In the midst of the pompous monuments of bad taste by which he has surrounded his retreat, the King lives as economically as his family, his generals, and his ministers."

The court of the great Catharine, where Golovkin was made a chamberlain, was more magnificent. He received his nomination as an answer to a request which he had made of her in French verse. His functions were agreeable. He traversed the Imperial palace as if it were his own. "Every four days, each person of the court received two bottles of all the known wines, and one of every sort of liqueur, which made, if I remember rightly, sixty bottles." There was really a single duty, which consisted in amusing the sovereign. Fedor was highly successful in this respect; he told her stories, read to her when she was half asleep in her bed, made for her charming vistas in the Park of Tsarskoe-Selo. The Empress confided to him the Embassy to Naples, but he mixed too much in the affairs of the kingdom, and wrote satirical verses on the Queen which made it impossible for him to remain there. He fell into disgrace, returned by short stages to Russia, stopping on his way in Venice with the Prince of Nassau-Siegen, and on his arrival was imprisoned in the fortress of Pernau. He was liberated at the death of Catharine, and the Emperor Paul I. made him master of ceremonies. He did not gain the good graces of his wild and capricious master, and in 1800 he was ordered to retire to his estates. He tells us, in a letter addressed to a friend, that he employed the year of his new exile in teaching the children of the village to read, and in writing a universal history.

His exile ceased on the succession to the throne of Alexander I.; from that moment he lived the life of a cosmopolitan. He spent the first years of the century at Dresden, where he became very intimate with Metternich. We find him in 1804 at Berlin, where he was patronized by the beautiful Queen Louise. After the peace of Tilsit, he established himself in Paris.

"I had here," he says, "great successes in society, which in France is decisive of so many things, since by my manners, my language, and even my defects I was eminently French, and my political nullity removed all constraint from the kindness with which people treated me. Placed at once in the midst of the best society, I seemed like a plant of the soil, and a plant cultivated in the fine days of the old society."

I shall not follow him to Switzerland, to Florence. Wherever he went, he took pleasure in writing, having a number of correspondents. He was a very agreeable *causeur;* at times he tried his hand on political questions, and wrote, among other pamphlets, 'Considerations on the Moral Constitution of France.' His memoirs are the most important part of his work, and in them the most interesting chapters are the recollections of the court and the reign of Paul I. They deserved to be published, and M. Bonnet's Introduction is a very valuable

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chapter of history. Count Fedor appears in it as a type of a class of Russians who felt the influence of French ideas and of Occidental civilization, and who formed an exceptional élite, deprived of all political power, the ornaments, not the real inspirers and supporters, of autocracy.

Correspondence.

KEATS AND HIS INTERPRETERS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: My attention has just been called to Dr. Garnett's interesting letter to the *Nation* of December 21, on Keats's "beautiful line":

"Clasp'd like a missal where swart Paynims pray."

May I, even at this late hour, offer some remarks on the subject? I must confess that, to my mind, this beautiful line ought not to be called beautiful, because it fails in its object, even—granting that it means anything at all.

The object of a comparison is, we are taught, to make matters more striking and clear. When Shakspere tells us that Hamlet's revenge will be swift as "the thoughts of love," we all know what is meant; the comparison is as clear as it is beautiful. If we had been told that Hamlet would move as swiftly as a pterodactyl, the comparison would not have been beautiful, because obscure; few people know what a pterodactyl is; fewer have fixed ideas as to its slowness or rapidity, which have not been recently tested.

Keats's line, in his otherwise splendid stanza xxvii., is, I blush to say, "pterodactyl" to me. The poet's intention is to make us understand the state of Madeline, "in her soft and chilly nest," when, at last,

"——the poppied warmth of sleep oppress'd
Her soothed limbs."

He describes her in different ways, and, among others, as being, as we said,

"Clasp'd like a missal where swart Paynims pray."

For the comparison to be clear, or indeed to mean anything, it should be notorious that missals are to be found clasped in Paynim land. But they are not, and never were. Clasped or no, Paynims keep no such books, and no one has ever believed that they did. So that the means chosen to make us understand in what particular way Madeline was "clasped," far from giving us any light, leaves us in greater darkness than before: witness the conflicting interpretations of the wisest and cleverest critics.

Let us even assume that the words have the sense, and that the poet had the intention, alleged by Dr. Garnett: the line will not be better, nor the comparison more appropriate. The occasion is Madeline's sleep, which is to last, at most, until morn, and which in fact lasts much less. How can she be properly "compared," to use Dr. Garnett's own words, "to a shut missal, . . . with the heightening circumstance that not only is the missal shut, but it is shut in Heathenesse, where it will never be opened"? If so, the comparison should have been reserved for the time when Madeline's eyes would "never be opened" again—the time, not of her sleep, but of her death.

It was a fault only too common among the lyricists of the nineteenth century to string together beautiful words, suggesting, at most, a meaning, rather than having any. More than one line of this sort is to be found in Musset, a fault to be condoned, not praised.

Recalling the trouble given to literary connoisseurs, in past times as now, by Keats's line, Dr. Garnett mentions the sad case of Philarète Chasles, who, wanting to translate the passage, went absolutely astray, replaced one word by another, and, not knowing what to do with the epithet "swart," quietly suppressed it. To do so, observes Dr. Garnett, is to meet the difficulty "in true French fashion." From the pen of such a scholar such a generalization may surprise. What Chasles did deserves all blame and is quite wrong, but has nothing especially French. In giving a new edition of an old text (Matthew Paris's 'Chronica Majora'), H. R. Luard wrote thus of a predecessor: "He has not the slightest scruple in altering what he does not understand, or changing words or expressions that he does not like." The predecessor Luard alludes to was not a Frenchman; he was Archbishop Parker.

JUSSERAND.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 31, 1906.

OUR SLOVENLY SPEECH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your correspondent, in this week's issue, who writes on current oral English touches a responsive chord. We have lately heard much of the Gaelic movement, and there is enthusiasm in the effort to revivify the beautful Irish speech, for long time in languishment. But surely here in America there is present need of an apostle of English—an American Hyde—who will lead a crusade in behalf of the revival of our mother tongue. Mr. Henry James sounded the tocsin in his address, last summer at Bryn Mawr. He is competent to lead, but has forsaken us and fled with hands to ear.

As he points out, the sad thing is, indeed, the absence in us of the consciousness of sin. People whose grammar is of the schools, whose complacency is supreme, whose means assure them the conventional elegancies of life, are tone-deaf to the unhappy sounds they emit as human speech. One hears people of scholastic culture in Northwestern college towns, for example, discourse learnedly of Athenian philosophy while they burr their r's in the most hopelessly Theban way; and then these same people are heard to observe that, whatever the dialectic peculiarities of New England or the South may be, there is nothing distinctively peculiar in their own speech! Alas, their speech bewrayeth them. Here and there, indeed, throughout the land we may hear a voice of "Englishe undefyled," but it is the voice of one crying in the wilderness.

Respectfully,
HENRY LEVERETT CHASE.

ST. LOUIS, January 27, 1906.

A PLEA FOR INDIRECT DISCOURSE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Among the changes in the English language for which American newspapers are responsible is the decrease in the use of indirect discourse in the reporting of conversations and public addresses. The prevailing appetite of editors for interviews in the form of dialogue or monologue compels the reporter to dress up in quotation-marks sentences and paragraphs which may represent well or ill the ideas of the person quoted, but which, being based on the reporter's memory or at best his longhand notes, cannot possibly be what they pretend to be, namely, the exact language of the speaker. I do not complain of those newspapers whose frankly avowed object is to deck out all their news items in the smartest language possible, without regard to either original facts or original words; if they wish to clothe the alleged ideas of college professors, prize-fighters, and shoplifters in the uniform elegances of reportorial English, their readers, being sometimes diverted thereby and rarely deceived, have no grievance that I feel called upon to present. On the other hand, many newspapers that are governed by the motive of giving the public accurate reports have come so far under the influence of these sprightly purveyors of fictitious news as to put pressure on their reporters to serve up no news that is not spiced with interviews, and no interviews that are not garnished with the symbols of direct discourse. The result is that one rarely finds in an American newspaper a quotation of any length in indirect discourse, and one is led to doubt whether one reporter in ten could execute a paragraph of it without doing violence to its proper moods and tenses.

The average person seeking to reproduce from memory the statements of another succeeds best if he devotes himself to mastering the ideas rather than the mere words of his informant. An interviewer who patches together such words and phrases as he can remember in order to make a connected statement in direct quotation, is not so likely to reproduce faithfully the thought of his informant as he would be if he did the best he could with his own words in indirect discourse. Moreover, the person interviewed is usually as averse to masquerading in language not exactly his own as he is to wearing another person's clothes. Given the exact words of a speaker, the choice between direct and indirect discourse may well be made in favor of the livelier form; but when the only possible thing is to repeat the sense or general purport of a statement, or when it is obviously necessary to summarize a long passage in a few sentences, indirect discourse, which clearly limits the responsibility of the original speaker, is surely the only honest method of quotation. A careful observance of this principle would give our newspapers much freer access to the confidence of public men, many of whom, exasperated as much by the English put into their mouths by false quotation-marks as by the misrepresentation of their ideas, utterly refuse to "talk for publication," although their opinions may be reasonably desired by the public.

It is not necessary that our reporters should copy the English newspapers to the extent of laboriously turning long verbatim reports into indirect discourse for purposes of publication; but they would do well to exercise their pens in that fashion now and then if they would not lose the use of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an indispensable implement of expression.

I am, sir, etc., J. D. GREENE.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., January 31, 1906.

THE EGYPTIAN RESEARCH ACCOUNT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your valuable review of Capart's 'Primitive Art in Egypt' (p. 104, Feb. 1) alludes to the "Research Account of the Egypt Exploration Fund"; and as there is much misapprehension concerning the Research Account, and I have many inquiries to answer about it, let me state that the "Egyptian Research Account" society has no connection with the Fund society. It is practically an entirely new society, and its organization, of recent date, has Sir John Lubbock for president, and over forty persons eminent in scholarship, official and civic position, or the like, for its committee. Professor Petrie, no longer connected with the Fund, is field director, and the continuance of his researches will now depend entirely upon the contributions to the "Research Account," as the circular states. The honorary secretary in London writes to me: "Professor Petrie's work has been so well supported in the past by his American friends that I feel quite sure we can look forward to a continuance of their favor; for I am certain that your frank appreciation of the grand work that he has done in Egypt is shared by very many of your countrymen."

I have already sent over many subscriptions, and I beg to add that I will gladly forward all subscriptions of not less than five dollars each (which entitles to the illustrated volume of the season) to this splendid cause in the hands of a master famous for his economy and skill. I have subscribed $25; and I pay every cost, so that *all* may go intact to Petrie's direct work *in situ* and the publication of the results.

(Rev.) WILLIAM COPLEY WINSLOW.

525 BEACON STREET, BOSTON,
February 3, 1906.

THE HONOR SYSTEM IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Prof. W. L. Stevens, writing on "The Honor System in American Colleges" in the February number of the *Popular Science Monthly*, refers to the early date of the establishment of that system at the South Carolina College. Permit me to give, through your columns, a few pieces of evidence in proof of his statements.

The honor system was here a growth. The first president, Jonathan Maxcy, a native of Massachusetts, had the board of trustees, at their meeting on the 19th of December, 1804, adopt as the basis of discipline this section (article vii. of the by-laws published at Columbia, S. C., 1805): "The rewards and punishments of this institution shall be all addressed to the sense of duty, and the principles of honor and shame." At the death of Dr. Maxcy in 1820 Prof. Robert Henry delivered an address, published in 1822, in which he said that Dr. Maxcy "appealed to the honor of his pupils, and required a faithful compliance with conditions which they themselves had voluntarily undertaken to perform."

In 1823 a most serious offence committed in the college chapel was the occasion of an investigation, the method of procedure of which shows that the honor system had by this time developed almost to the degree existing at the present. All students were required to answer whether they had committed, or had been accessory to, the offence in regard to which the faculty was conducting the investigation. The minutes of the faculty for April 10, 1823, have this comment: "Answers [*denials*] were given by the following students, who, of course, were considered as exonerated and allowed to retain their standing." By 1836 a regular method of procedure had been established. A student was not expected to incriminate any one else by his evidence. If he denied that he had anything to do with the offence of which he had been charged on reasonable presumptive evidence, he was regarded as *prima facie* not guilty; if his denial was afterwards found to be not true, he was expelled for lying.

Between 1807 and 1848 there were at least two editions of the by-laws of the College, but no copy is accessible, so that I have determined the dates 1823 and 1836 from the MS. minutes of the faculty, which are preserved in the College Library.

Very truly yours, EDWIN L. GREEN.

SOUTH CAROLINA COLLEGE, COLUMBIA,
January 26, 1906.

Notes.

Further spring announcements by the Macmillan Company are a 'Memoir of Archbishop Temple,' in two volumes; 'Persia, Past and Present,' by Prof. A. V. Williams Jackson, with numerous illustrations; and 'Kaempfer's History of Japan in 1693,' translated in three volumes by J. G. Scheuchzer.

G. P. Putnam's Sons will shortly issue 'From a College Window,' a collection of serial papers from the *Cornhill Magazine*, with six essays not before published, by Arthur C. Benson, author of 'The Upton Letters.'

The Burrows Publishing Company, Cleveland, announce the extension of Avery's 'History of the United States' from twelve to fifteen volumes. Original subscribers will have the three last gratis; subscribers to the fifteen may similarly find themselves presented with a sixteenth (*i. e.*, the index volume, unless that be the fifteenth).

Mr. E. F. Henderson's 'Short History of Germany,' which on its appearance four years ago we judged to be the best in English for that part of it (the main) treating of the period between the beginning of the Reformation and the establishment of the German Empire, has been brought out in a single volume by Macmillan.

Messrs. Longman's school edition of Palgrave's 'Golden Treasury' will certainly find favor. Mr. Herbert Bates has freely handled the compiler's notes, and added his own. The general reader may disregard both in pursuit of the poems alone. There is an index of first lines, and a conspectus of the contributory poets.

The parent 'Who's Who' for 1906 (London: Black; New York: Macmillan) boasts its 58th year of issue and of usefulness. Its newest wrinkles are an enumeration (not naming) of sons and daughters, and indication of motor and telephone numbers and telegraphic addresses. Now that American, German, and Italian copies of 'Who's Who' are springing into existence, the advisability of cleaving to British "somebodies" alone is worth considering, in view of the growing bulk of the work.

A stately 'Deutsches Zeitgenossenlexikon: Biographisches Handbuch deutscher Männer und Frauen der Gegenwart' (Leipzig: Schulze & Co.; New York: Lemcke & Buechner) follows close upon the heels of the smaller and more nimble 'Wer ist's? Unsere Zeitgenossen.' Eight hundred pages in the German letter now compete with one thousand and upwards in Roman type; and if the latter seems an advantage for 'Wer ist's?' it is offset by a minimum of abbreviations in the Lexikon. Further comparison shows a wider range in 'Wer ist's?'—the Lexikon's choice of eminent contemporaries being rather strictly confined to the German Empire, though exceptions have been made in the case of certain Austrians and Swiss. Page one in the two works has ten notices for 'Wer ist's?' against four for the Lexikon, and only two are in common. The information contained in these is substantially identical. It appears, therefore, that a shelf supplied with both these dictionaries of contemporaries will be richer than with either alone; but we fear the cheapness and portability of 'Wer ist's?' may seriously affect the publishers' purpose to make an annual of the Lexikon. Few of its notices exceed half a column, and the Emperor Wilhelm gets no more space than Sudermann; both less than Paul Heyse, thanks to his literary productivity.

'Napoleon's Love Story' (Dutton) is a novel by a Polish author, Waclaw Gasiorowski, translated by Count de Soissons. It breathes history at every pore, for even in the translator's preface we are thrilled by the information that in 1863 [*sic*] twenty-five thousand Polish horsemen defeated 300,000 Turks under the walls of Vienna! The author is looked on by his countrymen as the champion of the school of writers who follow Sienkiewicz, and his book may therefore appeal to some of the readers of 'Quo Vadis.'

Mr. Ernest Radford remarks, in the prefatory text of the volume of the Newnes Art Library devoted to Rossetti (Frederick Warne & Co.): "Whilst the quality of the original must necessarily be lost in the reproduction, the design is at any rate there, by means of which we are brought almost as close to the artist on his intellectual side as we should have been by the original, and, with illustrations so arranged as to take us through the stages of his career, are not altogether without guides." This is a fair statement of the usefulness of such books of reproductions if they only were "so arranged as to take us through the stages of a career," but for some reason the publishers persist in ignoring this or any other visible principle of arrangement, and to follow Mr. Radford's chronological account of Rossetti's work you must go skipping through the plates hunting for the one you want, and lucky when you find it.

M. Arsène Alexandre takes the tone of personal reminiscence in the introduction to the volume on 'Puvis de Chavannes' in the same series; and though he has little

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of importance to tell us, that little is first-hand information, not mere compilation. By a curious blunder the detail plates of the "Ludus pro Patria" credit that decoration to Rouen, though the small ensemble plate gives the correct ascription to Amiens.

It was, perhaps, hardly to be expected that Mrs. Ady (Julia Cartwright) should make of her 'Raphael' in the Popular Library of Art (London: Duckworth; New York: Dutton) such an original piece of analysis or so illuminating a biography as one or two other little books in this useful series. Pretty much everything has already been said about Raphael, and all that a writer can hope to do is to give a rational and well-balanced résumé of accepted criticism and acknowledged fact. This Mrs. Ady has done acceptably, and the volume is a worthy successor to its forerunners.

In 'The Modern Trust Company' (Macmillan), F. B. Kirkbride and J. E. Sterrett offer us the first detailed account of the organization and operation of trust companies. As such, the book supplies a genuine want, and should receive a hospitable reception. The authors have made a careful study of the distinctly technical side of their subject, and have produced a book similar in its general features to the best works upon what is usually called "practical banking." But, to the larger economic problems caused by the rapid development of trust companies, the scantiest attention is given. The authors do well to show the desirability of having adequate cash reserves maintained by companies engaged in an ordinary banking business, but they should have devoted more than three pages to this important and timely subject. They do well, also, to point out the importance of frequent public statements of the condition of these institutions, yet merely touch upon the topic, which ought to have received extended treatment. In future editions, it is to be hoped that more attention will be given to these larger questions of public policy. The care and judgment with which the rest of their work is done, justify the belief that our authors are competent to deal with the broader aspects of their subject. As their book now stands, however, it fails to give us all that we have a right to expect from a comprehensive treatise upon trust companies.

Charles A. Conant's 'Principles of Money and Banking' (Harper & Bros.) is a comprehensive treatise, parts of which have already appeared in economic and financial periodicals. It is not written for the purpose of demolishing the "quantity theory," extirpating the bimetallist, or advocating an "asset currency," but is devoted to irenic exposition rather than polemical discussions. Withal it is written clearly and interestingly, and should prove a useful work of reference at many points. Viewed as a systematic treatise, however, the critic's verdict cannot be wholly favorable. Mr. Conant has read widely the English and French literature on his subject, but has made no use of the German. He has not always discriminated between what was novel to him and what would be new to a well-informed reader. His pages are encumbered with superfluous quotations upon unimportant topics, which he could have dismissed equally well with a few words of his own. His historical chapters are sometimes painfully inadequate, and his treatment of theoretical subjects not always satisfactory. He is at his best in the discussion of various practical topics with which he has had wide and varied experience; elsewhere, many of his chapters do not rise above the level of the commonplace. With conspicuous merits and serious defects, the book will be held in varying estimation by different readers and critics.

Gannett, Garrison, & Houston's 'Commercial Geography' represents still another attempt to meet the demand for a text-book on trade. It registers an advance over some of its predecessors in that it lays distinct stress upon the physical and social conditions of commerce; in other words, it reduces more nearly to their relative importance the statistical materials which formerly well-nigh made up what posed as commercial geography. But this process is carried out in the present volume, as it seems to us, in a degree still insufficient. Considerably over half of the material is statistical, and is set off by itself instead of being interspersed in the more general and philosophical part, either directly or by cross-reference, by way of immediate illustration of principles there set forth. Statistical materials always afford difficulties to the student, and especially to the schoolboy; and it is only by the most skilful use of the nucleus-principle that any life can be put into them. Pedagogically, then, this book is still defective; and as for the scientific discussion of the conditions of commerce, this seems incomplete and insufficiently systematic, and in many cases too condensed. The treatment varies between passages of complex implication and others of a more suitable simplicity. It is to be feared that the teacher himself, unless specially trained along these lines, will have trouble in extracting from this book the new point of view.

A foreign work upon the same subject (Eckert's 'Grundriss der Handelsgeographie,' Leipzig, 1905) comes nearer to a scientific treatment of the subject than any other we have seen. Practically, all the essential principles of the influence of environment are rehearsed in the first volume, together with apposite examples. All the more purely local and statistical matter is referred to a second volume. If the book were more attractively set up, with larger and less crowded type, the impression of dull *Gelehrsamkeit* which it gives would be to a great extent removed. In the hands of a skilful translator permitted to omit, paraphrase, and manipulate, Eckert's work could be made into a text-book considerably superior to any we now have in English. As it stands, it is a valuable reference volume for any one who teaches the subject.

The fourth volume of the 'Jahrbuch der deutschen Bibliotheken' has just appeared, containing the usual lists of libraries and librarians in the German Empire, statistical tables, and new statutes and regulations. Among the latter we find the new Royal Ordinance regulating the appointments to the higher library service in Bavaria. The chief library in that country is the Hof- und Staatsbibliothek in Munich, and the second half of the apprenticeship which all would-be librarians must serve must be gone through there, while in case of the first half the candidates may choose between that library, the university libraries, and a couple of other specified institutions. In addition to the apprentice work, the candidates must attend lectures in the history of printing and the book trade, in palæography, library administration, and bibliography. Since the publication of the previous volume, two libraries have joined the international library loan system, namely, the Public Library of Geneva, Switzerland, and the library of Columbia University in New York, the latter being the first American institution to join.

The first annual volume of the 'Annotationes,' issued by the Concilium Bibliographicum in Zurich, has just been completed. It contains, besides the report for 1904 and sundry notes in regard to the card indexes of the Concilium, reprints or abstracts of a number of "Articles dealing with the Concilium Bibliographicum and its Work," in continuation of the bibliography of such articles during the years 1893 to 1904, also found in this volume. The latter is partly reprinted from the Bibliography of Coöperative Cataloguing and the Printing of Catalogue Cards presented as a thesis to the School of Library Science of the University of Illinois by Messrs. T. Jahr and A. J. Strohm, and printed in 1903 by the Library of Congress. The most important announcement of the Concilium itself is that in regard to the resumption of its card bibliography of physiology, accompanied by an excellent study of the proper scope of a bibliography, the completeness to be attained, the arrangement of the material, etc.

The *National Geographic Magazine* for January contains as its first article Gen. A. W. Greely's address on geographical exploration, delivered at the Carnegie Institute in Pittsburgh. This is followed by an entertaining account of the Florida Keys and their products by John Gifford. A railroad to Key West is in process of construction, binding the different Keys together like a string of pearls. The writer, who has a plantation on Elliott's Key, from which he picked in one day cocoanuts, bananas, limes, pineapples, papaws, sapodillas, sugar apples, sweet potatoes, tomatoes, eggplants, and peppers, prophesies that they will soon be the site of many winter villas and gardens. The greater part of the remainder of the number is devoted to a report of the speeches delivered at the annual dinner of the National Geographic Society, but fitted for the columns of a newspaper rather than for what purports to be a scientific journal. The new department of geographical squibs is also to be regretted as a further lowering of dignity of this periodical. Many of the illustrations, interesting in themselves, have no reference to anything in the text, but seem to be inserted to increase the bulk of the number.

Petermann's Mitteilungen, No. 11, has for its article of most general interest an account, by Alb. Grubauer, of an expedition into the interior of the Malay Peninsula made for the purpose of studying the few remaining aborigines. After much difficulty he was able to find one of their villages. He describes the inhabitants as scarcely middle-sized, but well formed and excessively shy, evidently resembling strongly, in this as well as in their habits of life, the pygmies of the Central African forest. The other leading contents are a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

summary of our present knowledge of the Antarctic Ocean, and a description of the hurricane which last June raged in the Marshall Islands, both accompanied by maps. There is further a report of the proceedings of the third International Glacier Conference, held in the Engadine in September, 1905; Prof. H. F. Reid of Johns Hopkins being the presiding officer. In No. 12 Theodor Strauss gives an account of a recent journey in the province of Luristan, western Persia, which was both difficult and dangerous from the utter lack of an organized government and the consequent lawlessness of the people. "Robbery and plundering is the order of the day here," a Persian prince said to him. A lengthy summary of Penck and Brückner's work on the Alps in the Ice Age, and an interesting table of the different nationalities or peoples in the Russian Empire in 1897, deserve notice. The leading race is of course the Slav; then comes the Turco-Tartar, while third in rank are the Jews, who number a little over five millions.

The annual list of new and important works added to the Boston Public Library is much larger than that of previous years. The greatest increase has been in works on the useful and industrial arts, and this shows both the present trend of mental activity and the aid which a public library can give towards developing the productive powers of an intelligent community. There has been an increase, too, in works on the fine arts, education, and science, with a falling off in works on general literature. A new and most useful departure is an author-index containing some 7,500 names, and if there was also a subject-index there would be little left to be desired.

Major von Brug, a recognized authority in the department of aerial navigation, has presented his library on this subject, exceptionally rich in historical and descriptive works, to the Deutsches Museum of Munich. German journals pronounce this the best collection of books, charts, maps, etc., on the subject in the Empire, if not in Europe.

We have already spoken of the municipal purchase of the house in Odense where Hans Christian Andersen was born April 2, 1805, for the purpose of transforming it into an Andersen House, in which may be preserved objects associated with Denmark's best-known writer. By the help of early drawings, both the exterior and the interior will be restored to their original appearance, and the Danish public is now called upon to contribute material for its furnishing. Valuable objects have already been presented by the Collin family, Andersen's most intimate friends, the composer Edvard Grieg and others, and the local committee has purchased a set of furniture used by Andersen for twenty years and the 109 original drawings for the 'Wonder Tales' by Wilhelm Pedersen. It is safe to say that no similar undertaking, with the exception of the Shakspere birthplace, will appeal to a larger number of persons throughout the world; and if every one who has had his childhood days brightened by the works of this Danish genius would contribute a penny, the committee of Odense citizens would have a large amount at their disposal.

The Cape-to-Cairo Railway has been constructed to the Kafue River, 260 miles beyond the Victoria Falls. At the present rate of progress, a mile a day, the Broken Hill zinc and lead mines will be reached in June. Then there will be uninterrupted communication by rail with Cape Town, 2,015 miles distant. The next point aimed at is a rich copper area on the Congo State border. The railway, according to Sir Charles Metcalfe, who has just returned from a preliminary survey of the country between the railhead and the Free State, is a great peacemaker. The whole of the region, he reports, is tranquil and secure, presenting a great contrast to the condition of affairs a few years ago. The natives are now free from the raids from which they suffered, and enjoy security of property.

The highly respectable position which the Equal Suffrage movement has now attained to is evidenced by the fact that at the annual convention which begins its sessions to-day in Baltimore (February 7-13), meetings will be presided over by President Remsen, Dr. Welch, and Mayor Timanus, and addresses will be made, among others, by Governor Warfield and Secretary Bonaparte. Miss Anthony will celebrate in Washington on February 14 her eighty-sixth birthday.

—In the February *Atlantic*, William Everett discusses the United States Senate with his usual vigor, chiefly in respect of its usurpation of power rightly belonging to the Executive. Such discussions are comparatively useless, however, so long as Presidents continue willing to barter Constitutional prerogatives for the furtherance of favored measures through Congress. Taking the history of the country as a whole, the Presidency is hardly less culpable than the Senate in disturbing the proper balance of power. Dr. Everett has no faith in any scheme to improve the Senate by Constitutional amendment providing for popular election. The Constitution, he thinks, should remain practically unalterable. Have we not discovered, however, that there are other and easier ways of alteration than amendment? Andrew D. White returns to his studies in the "Warfare of Humanity with Unreason," presenting in this issue the first part of a paper on Turgot, "a great thinker, writer, administrator, philanthropist, statesman, and, above all, a great character and a great man," though a failure by ordinary standards of judgment, since he was driven speedily from his culminating position and lived "only long enough to see every leading measure to which he had devoted his life deliberately and malignantly undone." On the purely literary side, William C. Hazlitt's presentation of new "Eliana" is the most attractive feature, though those of us who used to enjoy 'Dream Life' and the 'Reveries of a Bachelor' in simpler days may thank Mrs. Annie Russell Marble for a chance to take a half-hour from "doing things" for a study of the charm of "Ik Marvel."

—Dr. Nevinson's closing paper on the "African Slave-Trade" in *Harper's* scarcely attains the sensational character suggested in the advance notice of a month ago. He has proved clearly enough what people who have cared to look into the matter already knew—that the slave-trade exists to-day, with all the hideous characteristics which it has had in the past, and must ever have. Whether we shall find the way out without the rise of a new band of agitators, as single-minded, as resolute, and at the start as obnoxious to the feelings of the majority, as were the American Abolitionists of seventy years ago, is somewhat doubtful. Abbey's illustrations of "Julius Cæsar" are accompanied by Harold Hodge's critical comment, parts of which recall some of Swinburne's comments in previous numbers of the same series. To be told that Calvary alone can surpass in awe the murder of Julius Cæsar can hardly strengthen one's faith in the competence of the critic. One disposed to scent imitation easily might recall here the similar outburst of F. Marion Crawford that Brutus, in murdering Cæsar, "blackened the name of friendship with a stain that will outlast time, and by a deed second only in infamy to that of Judas Iscariot." Such criticism elucidates the critics rather than the dramas of Shakspere or the facts of Roman history. The Easy Chair is at its best in discussing Mr. Holt's recent paper on the "Commercialization of Literature." It is only the publication of literature that is commercialized. The author, even when tempted from one publisher to another by higher royalties, of course maintains his artistic ideal, and so his literature is as free of the money taint as ever, "just as the heart of a lady released from its allegiance by the divorce court is as essentially true as ever, and may be so transferred to a new object of devotion."

—The *Century* has chosen to make the memory of Keats its chief mid-winter feature. A paper on the "Portraits of Keats," by William Sharp, is accompanied by a dozen illustrations, half of which are from the various portraits by Joseph Severn. Mr. Sharp seriously questions the genuineness of many miniatures of Keats generally attributed to Severn, giving instances of bold attempts to dispose of forgeries under his name. Mr. Gilder tells of a visit to Severn, in his apartment at the Fountain of Trevi, in 1879, where he first saw the life-mask of Keats's face, a copy of which he brought to America. Another copy he gave to Philip Bourke Marston, and through these two copies, used for illustration in the editions of Keats by Buxton Forman and John Gilmer Speed, the mask has become widely known on both sides of the water. A striking illustration of the delicate touch of Helen Keller was furnished by this mask. Upon passing her fingers over the face, in Mr. Gilder's presence, she immediately said, "He smiles." Now, the smile, which undoubtedly exists, is so slight that many would not recognize it at all from the reproductions on paper, and Mr. Gilder states that it can be perceived by the eye in the mask itself only when the light is rightly adjusted. President Spencer's plea for the railroads in the January number, as against a Federal rate-making commission, is counterbalanced by a paper on the other side from Charles A. Prouty, of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is easy to point out the sins of railroads, and this he does, with evidence which must be convincing were there anybody still to convince. What one misses, here as everywhere else, from the President's utterances down, is any valid proof that the methods under discussion will afford a workable remedy.

—The editors of *Scribner's* have chosen to give the mind of their readers a rest from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strenuous themes, with the exception of the few who care enough for "abroad" to be stirred to a strenuous mood by Mr. Millard's paper on the "New China," a paper which will doubtless gain a few readers from its writer's established reputation for "other-sidedness" in Eastern affairs. Francis Wilson opens the number with a reminiscent paper on "Joseph Jefferson at Work and Play," acompanied by an interesting group of photographic illustrations, in two of which ex-President Cleveland appears, naturally with fishing-rod in hand. Ernest Thompson Seton writes of the moose and his antlers, with a score or more of illustrations from his own and other collections. George Moore contributes reminiscences of the Impressionist painters, and the Field of Art gives a brief, though very favorable, account of the "Gallery of National Portraiture" assembled by the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts last November.

—William O'Brien's 'Recollections' (Macmillan) are given to us in an attractively printed volume of over five hundred pages. They are brought down no later than to 1882 and his return as member for Mallow. The portraits of Mr. Parnell, Mr. Butt, Archbishop Croke, and himself are excellent. The dedication, to "The Mother of My Wife," does credit to his heart. Mr. O'Brien wields a facile pen. Old Fenian days in Ireland are graphically and on the whole truthfully portrayed. The struggles of an Irish lad from indigence to eminence are affectingly told. His proposal of marriage at sixteen to a pretty actress is idyllic; and dramatic was their meeting twenty years afterwards in the House of Commons, of which he was then a prominent member, she having been twice married in the interval. It would not be easy in literature to find a more pathetic incident than his vigil beside the remains of one brother, who had died of consumption, whilst in adjoining rooms a brother and a sister were in their last hours from the same fell disease. The book will be read with interest by all who have lived through those days and who are interested in Irish affairs. Mr. O'Brien is over-generous in his estimate of the characters of many of those with whom he has worked, and appears to have broken with others with whom through most of his career he was most closely connected. As material for history, the volume must be used with caution. The author is often carried away in his statements of fact by what he would wish to believe had been, rather than by what really was; and his recollection of events does not always accord with that of others who were as much behind the scenes and have had as good opportunity of judging as to the truth.

—Hjalmar Cassel, a Swedish engineer who visited this country during the St. Louis Exposition, has published his impressions in a slender volume entitled 'American Business Methods' (Stockholm: Bonnier). The central chapter in the book is the one in which he puts the question: "Is the superiority of American industry based on better machinery?" This, he thinks, is not the case, though he finds American tools and machines superior to those made in Europe; but American machines are sold all over Europe, and are used to as good advantage there as here, at times to better. "Nobody who inspected the Exposition with impartial eyes could there find evidence supporting the opinion that American industry is qualitatively superior to that of the Old World, and that it uses mechanical appliances which are foreign to us. I am inclined to think that many European engineers were to a certain extent disappointed in what they saw of American productions. They had expected to find here, as well as in American factories, clear reasons why the United States has become such a powerful factor in the world's markets. But what they saw was in general not new, and the new was not instructive. They returned home enriched with a few details, but with the riddle unsolved." The reason for the superiority lies, in the author's opinion, in the better organization of offices and factories, the methodical supervision of every detail, the constant watchfulness that no single branch of a business fall behind, and last, but not least, the minute division of labor. Mr. Cassel had his eyes open and his wits about him as he wandered through streets and factories, and he discusses with insight both industrial and social conditions, though his glasses are too rose-colored.

PAUL'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND.

A History of Modern England. By Herbert Paul. In Five Volumes. Vols. III. and IV. The Macmillan Company. 1905.

These additional volumes of Mr. Paul's history of the latter half of the nineteenth century show the same qualities, the same style, the same manner, as did the earlier. Mr. Paul has too marked an individuality to vary much from himself. Here he is again bright, rapid, epigrammatic, free from all vagueness or hesitation, delivering positive and definite views, telling his story in short sentences whose meaning no one can mistake. He is not a partisan in the sense of endeavoring to suppress the case for the side to which he does not belong while setting out the whole of his own. But he has strong opinions, and allows them to appear. No one will think the worse of him for that, especially as he shows himself capable of recognizing from time to time the merits of individual opponents and the faults of his own party leaders.

His treatment is perhaps rather too chronological. When we want to know exactly what happened and the order of time in which each thing happened, we go to the *Annual Register*, or to some such summary of events as one finds in the *Political Science Quarterly*. From a history written thirty or forty years after the events one expects a rather different way of treating those events. They may then be grouped according to their natural connection, each group being handled separately, so as to explain those among the causes and those among the consequences of some important event which did not appear palpably on the surface just before or just after it occurred. This advantage of writing about events sufficiently far away from them for them to have fallen into their true perspective is not quite sufficiently turned to account. Mr. Paul does, indeed, see which are the bigger things he has to deal with; but he does not always isolate them for the purpose of showing their magnitude, and so help us look at them all round as being the capital phenomena to be comprehended and estimated.

An instance may serve to illustrate what we mean. Volume III. begins with the death of Lord Palmerston in 1865. His departure marked the closing of one era and the opening of another. Lord Russell became Prime Minister. Mr. Gladstone became leader of the House of Commons. They brought in a bill for the extension of the Parliamentary franchise, and the democratization of Great Britain began. They were defeated in committee on the bill, and forthwith resigned, but the stone had been set rolling, and it has continued to go on rolling ever since. In 1867 Mr. Disraeli passed a Reform Act which lowered the suffrage in boroughs further than Mr. Gladstone's bill of 1866 had proposed to do. After some years, during which the discussion of the subject was frequently interrupted by exciting crises in foreign and colonial affairs, another Reform act was passed in 1884 which lowered the Parliamentary suffrage in counties, followed next year by a Redistribution act which swept away many small constituencies and the few pocket boroughs that had survived. Thus in eighteen years from the close of the Whig-Liberal period which began in 1832 and ended in 1867, Great Britain had been turned into a country thoroughly democratic so far as her political constitution was concerned, save and except the retention of an hereditary House of Peers. This is one of the most remarkable revolutions that any modern country has seen, although its magnitude was concealed partly by the gradual and peaceful nature of the process, partly by the preservation of all the ancient forms and usages of the Constitution, partly by the fact that the working classes, who since 1885 have been completely masters of the situation, did not for some time realize their new power, and made comparatively little use of it to demand legislation in their own interest.

Now the questions which the student of history puts to himself upon the point are these: What brought about this revolution? Why was it effected so quietly and peacefully? Why did the Reform acts pass with the concurrence of both the great historical British parties? In 1832 the Tory party fought (to use a popular expression) like devils against the Reform bill of that time, which transferred political power from the landowners and men of wealth generally to the middle classes. But in 1867 and 1884 neither the rich nor the middle classes resisted the transference of power from themselves to the laboring class. If they had been terrified by menaces and the prospect of revolt on the part of the laboring class, one could understand this easy acquiescence. But that class, as a whole, showed little passion, and not even much impatience, for an extension of the franchise. These are problems which strike one who, with American history or French history in his mind, comes to the study of modern England; and, so far as we know, no writer on modern England has yet set himself to explain them. Let us hope that, in the concluding volume of his present work, Mr. Paul will devote adequate space to their investigation.

Another singular feature of English politics during the last fifty years comes out

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strikingly from such narratives as we have in Mr. Paul's book, and in that by Sir Spencer Walpole ('The History of Twenty-five Years'), which was noticed not long ago in these columns. It is the change in the attitude of public sentiment toward war on the one hand, and toward liberty on the other. It might have been expected—and contemporary observers did in fact expect—that the advent to power first of the middle classes and then of the working classes would increase the love of peace, and the disposition to concentrate attention upon domestic legislation calculated to benefit the classes forming the majority of the electorate. Mr. Cobden, for instance, and Mr. Bright, and Mr. Gladstone himself, all believed that as the danger of wars between nations would, if not extinguished, be at least immensely reduced by the general adoption of free trade, so the liking for war among the English would be reduced by the extension of the franchise to the class whence private soldiers are drawn, and by a diminution in the power of an aristocracy which had enjoyed war and found occupation in it. This has not, so far at least, proved to be the result. The Crimean war, which every one now admits to have been needless and foolish, was popular with the then dominant English middle class. There was an outburst of war feeling against Russia, equally foolish, in 1877, when the working class in the towns had been enfranchised, and another still more recent war, which nearly all foreign observers deem to have been quite as needless, and much more unfortunate than the Crimean war, was unquestionably popular, though, it would appear, rather less so among the workingmen than among the richer sort of people. How comes it that the wise men who knew their fellow-countrymen as Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright did, have turned out to be in this matter so mistaken?

Then, again, every one supposed that a democracy would, by the very law of its being, sympathize with freedom and those who were struggling for freedom all over the world. Having just won their political rights, they wish others to do the same. But in point of fact there has been less of such sympathy displayed in England since 1885, when England became a democratic country, than there was in the days described by Mr. Paul and Sir Spencer Walpole, when Lord Palmerston figured as a popular hero because he upheld the cause of the Italian patriotic party. There have evidently been causes at work modifying the old sentiments and creating new sentiments which were undreamt of in 1840-70. The growth of what is called "Imperialism," not only in England but also in America, is a phenomenon lying deeper down than the political struggles of the moment, and it needs more analysis than it has yet received.

Mr. Paul, though he cites few foreign authorities on matters of international politics, not even Prince Bismarck's 'Reminiscences,' or General Sir Charles Wilson's account of his effort to save Gordon at Khartum, describes England's part in world affairs with spirit. He is, however, most fresh and telling when he deals with the parliamentary side of politics, as in his sketch of the debates on the Eastern Question crisis, which several times became acute in 1876, 1877, and 1878. Having himself sat in the House of Commons, he understands its ways, and relishes the incidents which enliven representative assemblies. He often happily hits off the characteristics of eminent men, though he gives no finished studies of character, such as the example of Livy and Tacitus used to prescribe to historians of the last generation. Yet Lord Palmerston, Mr. Disraeli, Mr. Bright, and Mr. Gladstone, to say nothing of persons of the rank next below, such as Sir G. C. Lewis, Mr. Forster, Sir Stafford Northcote, Lord Selborne, Lord Granville, are more than sufficiently interesting to deserve a careful analysis of their gifts and of the causes which won popularity for them. Nothing, indeed, is more curious, or better illustrates the complex character of the English people, than the fact that four men so extremely unlike one another as the four first named should have all at one time or another during their long careers acquired so much hold over large sections of their fellow-countrymen.

Mr. Paul enjoys passing literary judgments no less than he does depicting dramatic political situations, but many of these judgments will not command universal assent. To speak of Mr. Lecky as having "written philosophical works of much interest and power" seems to attribute to him what he did not possess, and rather to ignore what were his special and distinctive merits. To call Professor Clifford "the first metaphysician of his age" is a bold and sweeping statement, which metaphysicians generally will by no means accept; nor does the view that Professor Seeley, no doubt a most powerful writer and lecturer, was "equally gifted as a writer and a thinker," stand on any better foundation. Few philosophers, we suspect, and even fewer Greek scholars, will agree to the glowing eulogy bestowed on the translations from Plato of Professor Jowett, who has other and better titles to fame.

As respects accuracy in matters of fact, very few mistakes have attracted our notice, and these of small moment. The statement in the account of the Hyde Park troubles of 1866 that "the railings were torn down in several places and the Park was invaded by the rougher portion of the mob" (p. 53 of vol. i.), is at variance with the best contemporary accounts, which show that the crowd was not a mob, and the first fall of the railings half an accident, due to the fact that, being weak, they gave under the crowd's pressure. So (p. 59) it is hardly right to say that "neither Kelly nor Bovill would have been appointed on purely professional grounds." In describing the murder of Sergeant Brett (vol. i., p. 110) it ought to have been stated that Brett was killed by a shot fired at the keyhole of the police van in order to break the lock. Mr. Disraeli's influence with and over Queen Victoria is antedated when it is given as beginning in 1867 (vol. i., p. 127). It began after 1874, when he was Prime Minister for the second time. In dwelling on the advantages British shipping has derived from the Suez Canal, Mr. Paul has omitted to mention that its opening has seriously injured English ports as centres of distribution for Europe.

Space fails us to cite more than three of the happy turns of phrase which abound in the book. Commenting on Lord Chancellor Westbury's fall, Mr. Paul observes: "Either prudence or moral sense seems to be required for lasting success, even in so imperfect a society as this." Of Mr. Ayrton he says: "He was made Judge Advocate-General, who in those days was neither a general, nor an advocate, nor a judge"; and of Mr. Bright, who talked in a breezy, irresponsible way: "He seldom remembered that he was in office except when he resigned."

MR. RUSSELL STURGIS'S LATEST BOOK.

A Study of the Artist's Way of Working in the Various Handicrafts and Arts of Design. By Russell Sturgis, A.M., Ph.D. 2 vols. Dodd, Mead & Co. 1905.

Some twenty years ago an imperial commissioner was sent from Japan to inquire into the Western methods of teaching and practising art in every direction, as well as the forming and management of museums; and naturally, too, the things that are put into museums—paintings, and sculpture, architecture, etc., etc. The Commissioner had never seen the West nor its arts, and on his way to Europe he remained a short time in the United States. He was puzzled for answers to his many questions, on all possible points, including naturally the literature relating to art. He was advised, and rightly, to go to Mr. Russell Sturgis, whose information was encyclopædic, and who would direct him also to find, when he could not be answered at once. The present book of Mr. Sturgis recalls this all-sufficient anecdote. It is a form of notebook, but also of encyclopædia, and one more offshoot of a habit of life constantly curious in everything connected with art. Over forty years ago, Mr. Sturgis was already a collector, and especially a collector of Japanese art, which was only beginning to be recognized throughout the Western world. Many of the examples and explanations and definitions of his book are the records of a collector who remembers, or who actually has in his hands or before him, the object that serves as a lesson or an explanation.

The people of the time of our earlier interest in art, some fifty years ago, were held in certain currents, and were influenced or moved along them by the intellectual tendencies just preceding. The "unending" Mr. Herbert Spencer encouraged us to believe that we were learning everything, and that, as Mr. John Fiske used to say, we held the world now by the tail, and could swing it if necessary. The world itself helped us by becoming more and more known each day. The encyclopædia, the sum of universal knowledge, was opened to us at length. We were still affected by the storm and stress of the energies of such minds as Mr. Carlyle and Mr. Ruskin, from which even now it is difficult to escape. In this very book we come across the wordings of those English influences—impossible statements, but accepted at that time as good rhetoric, and representing morally and intellectually that little point of the nineteenth century when everything was being settled. Hence, in this book, otherwise so practical, the Ruskinian forms of "unfailing care," "absolutely good," "absolute requirements," and so forth. One notes this with a feeling of the enormous distance between our phraseology of that past moment and the requirements of to-day, when relative truth is more frequently considered. But there was then in all that pertain-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ed to art a wave of enthusiasm which helped to carry one on. The necessary adjuncts—care and admiration for the Pre-Raphaelite school, especially as understood over here—marked some years of this interest in art, and here again in Mr. Sturgis's volume is at least one example of our American Pre-Raphaelites. But Mr. Sturgis at a very early day recognized the value of such contradictory work as that of Homer Martin and Winslow Homer, nor has he ever varied in his appreciation of these two important characters in American art. Always, whatever his views and studies may have been, Mr. Sturgis's walls have received works of drawing or painting which he has not been obliged to change. It is therefore with much right to speak as an expert that Mr. Sturgis has made this very large hand-book of certain parts of his experience. Moreover (as he says in his preface) his experience, that of an architect engaged in decorative work, has given him a lifetime of familiarity with fine arts in nearly all their forms, and in most cases a knowledge also of the processes employed—a familiarity gained in watching the work going on, if not in practising it.

The various methods through which the artist works, he has tried to connect, so that, for example, certain methods of painting are explained to a great extent by his description of the methods of sculpture, and both, too, again, by his consideration of design as evidenced in architecture, which is, of course, the fundamental basis of work in sculpture and painting, and, in fact, in every manner of the hands expressing such intention. Mr. Sturgis has been careful to keep before us the relation of what we may respectively call "practical" and "expressive" in these arts—for example, the actual use of paint, or what he denominates "flat" painting, as connected with the representative painting of more important art.

Of course, Mr. Sturgis can give but the merest glance at these matters. Any detail would become so enormous that a whole library would be necessary to explain more fully. For instance, even in "plain" painting, as we call it, the mere variety of preparation of the whites used in domestic architecture, in the eighteenth century, would fill a vast space. And, indeed, there used to be a book as large as Mr. Sturgis's volumes describing nothing but these tones of white and gray used in polite buildings of the eighteenth century. As Mr. Sturgis points out, to-day we do not go into such refinement, and the tone of the wall is near enough if there be no legal redress against it. It is difficult to have an architect, or even a painter, believe that there is a great difference between one tone and another of the same color, in decoration. One can fancy what architects of the eighteenth century would feel if they for an instant could see the whites and grays used in our modern millionaires' residences. Their wigs or their powdered hair would rise in astonishment at the commercial treatment of these delicacies of common art. This mere mention shows how almost impossible it is to gather together descriptions of methods in any one art, especially in the almost infinite art of painting, within the limits of an ordinary book. Nor are the explanations of artists, as given to the inquirer, always of much use. One frequently finds that an excellent practitioner of, let us say, painting knows nothing of the ninety-nine-hundredths remaining of the practice of painting. This is so frequent that one can be sure that such a case must have happened yesterday or the day before; that is to say, that some painter of considerable quality shall not know how the men of the eighteenth century, or the seventeenth, or sixteenth, or fifteenth, or fourteenth, or thirteenth, painted, nor how the great men painted—neither their preparations, nor their methods, nor their habits. All of which is perfectly natural, and, we think, is well referred to by Mr. Sturgis. But then, as those methods, in the minimum of present records, fill whole volumes, it will be seen how impossible it is to begin to describe them in sequence in the course of the few pages of an ordinary book. Their principles might be laid down, but Mr. Sturgis has not undertaken to do it, they being, perhaps, behind the facts rather than on top of them. Thus, the entire modern inquiry concerning painting, from the neighborhood of 1850, is not referred to by Mr. Sturgis, and perhaps wisely, as introducing a scientific and fundamental view which, as we have said, would rather underlie the inquiry than be evident in it. Of course, we all know that the inquiries into light and color have been one of the special points of the last sixty years, and that almost all painting has felt the result, and that a great deal of painting has been based upon it.

Mr. Sturgis, then, by putting aside these very fundamental points, gains the advantage of merely describing certain outside facts in the practice of the art, and these he again narrows by describing only two methods, which he follows out in a description of two paintings. These he takes apart in very abundant detail, to show the actual mechanism of two different methods, exemplifying, let us say, water-color work and painting in oil, and then he gives no more examples. Of course he cannot give even a few important manners of work without increasing the size of his book to something enormous. Painting, using for its method of addressing us the whole of the world that can be seen or imagined, is practically infinite. Innumerable are the variations which the future may introduce, as innumerable are the objects which the eye may notice, and these again are varied infinitely by every consideration of light and air and position, apart from the more hidden intentions of sacrificing or exaggerating to keep to the path chosen. With the artist who knows, no landscape painted is as true or as full of meaning as the landscapes which still remain to be represented. What has been done is satisfactory, because it is a part of this enormous country of choice. However wonderful the works of each one of the great masters, they are each deficient in something that another gives, and it is we who make the reality of what we see in them.

Mr. Sturgis has thought fit to place at the end of his volumes, rather than at the beginning, principles or notions regarding the artistic side of architecture. But he has begun his notices, his divisions, with one of the most valuable of all statements, and one which comes in very well at this very beginning, where he purposely analyzes some work of South Sea Islanders, who by most persons are considered as "primitive." He states that in his book "decorative art" will not be separated from other Fine Arts. Therein he has taken a position which is the proper one at the present moment when we are rather painfully escaping from the classifications of the last century. Nothing in the French Government management of Art seemed more ridiculous and impossible to the Japanese commissioner of whom we spoke a moment ago, than the existence of a special department for decoration, or painting with a decorative intent. This seemed to him (as it would to all remaining in the great path of the ancient ways) a curious error, bad in its effect, destructive of the reflex influences of the workman, certain to encourage the meaner sort, and thereby to keep the more important artists from an intimate relation with decoration, such as they have always had in the great past. But the French idea, which threatens us, perhaps, at this moment in our teaching, is not peculiar to France, and has had a remarkable influence on all the art of the nineteenth century. As already noted, the art of painting has had new directions forced upon it through the studies of nature made by scientists, and through a natural confusion of the intentions of painting, the realities seen being treated as the object of the painter, and not his means—that is to say, roughly, through the prevalence of a form of realism. Perhaps, in opposition, the so-called "ideal" of the school has its origin in the division we consider. That is why the result of the separation of the decorative and representative sides has been a number of foolish recipes in representative painting for what is called composition, *i. e.*, arrangement. This principle of all art has been represented by a few common-school formulæ, while, of course, the variations must be as numerous as the possible combinations of geometry. Mr. Sturgis will remember how a distinguished foreign decorator, lecturing to the Architectural League, assured them that Japanese decoration or painting was pure haphazard—unlike his own three or four recipes. But a fairly large proportion of British criticism has to be looked upon as the subject of pure amusement, such as Mr. Whistler delighted in.

To return to our explanation: The decorative side of art, which is nearer to fundamental principles and beginnings, was therefore forcibly separated from that side of painting which represented stories, or, again, which aimed at copying the aspect of nature. More and more the artist—meaning thereby the real artist—was separated from the artisan. Instead of lifting the artist, this degraded him, as happens to all parvenus, and he sought to make his pictures by recalling stories or subjects or intentions, instead of carrying them out by their physical qualities of art. The result has been the increase of the commercial influence in art. In England the fact has stamped an impress of snobbishness upon almost all British art, and all the more in the corners and places which were believed to have escaped it. The exclusiveness of the refinement of some years back had its blossom in the forms of art with which we might associate certain names—for instance, that of Morris. All the genius of Rossetti could barely emerge from it. Burne-Jones complained

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that his own stained glass became commercial, but he could not see why, being immersed in the same waters. And if his art was impressed by it, what could we expect from others? Burne-Jones had painted outside of his glass, and was a master apart from this. The inferiority of work in this form of decoration, as in most others, is the inferior capacity and experience of the decorators outside of what they do. Since the separation spoken of, no great artist has devoted time to these arts except in the superficial way just explained. The result is necessarily middle-class art, the art of the house-decorator, the ecclesiastical art furnisher. When the decorator can challenge the artist in any other line, he has a right to lead, not before. Mr. Sturgis refers many times to such points—there being no objection to the commercial, or a certain part of it; it is only the misplacement that confuses. The work of art, of course, cannot be duplicated, or done in batches, and this definition helps. We have heard that the Oriental judges have criteria for dividing works of art into the real (original) and the imitation—as our ladies have for lace. We can remember how our Imperial commissioner, on his first sight of European paintings, so divided them with incredible rapidity. We remember how he said at once, on looking at what seemed to us merely very good work, "Oh, this man is one of a set."

Lessons in this direction Mr. Sturgis intends to give all through his book. If they be not all evident, it is to be attributed to the main difficulty of our educational work—that of addressing a multitude so as to include the "lower forms." In the teaching of the Fine Arts this has become the great obstruction. In the art of writing we still hold to high or fine examples. Thus, even if good of their kind, no school or college would use advertisements as models of literature. Our authors' models are almost always of the highest class. And, as the Master said, "Make your acquaintances of your superiors; if that be not possible, then consort with equals, but never with inferiors—because we are the result of what we touch."

TWO GREAT GAZETTEERS.

Lippincott's New Gazetteer: A Complete Pronouncing Gazetteer or Geographical Dictionary of the World, etc., etc. Edited by Angelo Heilprin and Louis Heilprin. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. [1905], 1906. 8vo, pp. x., 2,053.

Ritter's Geographisch-Statistisches Lexikon: Neunte vollständig umgearbeitete, sehr vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage, unter der Redaktion von Johannes Penzler. Erster Band, A-K. Leipzig: Otto Wigand; New York: Lemcke & Buechner. 1905. 8vo, pp. 1,248.

A spirit of benevolence as well as sense of incompetence may fitly possess the reviewer of a new edition of a world-gazetteer. Lippincott's has long held a more than respectable position in its class, but the revision of 1880 was but patched up in 1893, and the difficult task of a fresh revision had finally to be faced. The Messrs. Heilprin were almost the foreordained directors of it. Sons of a cyclopædic scholar, the late Michael Heilprin, strong especially in historical and geographical knowledge, and reared amid the making of cyclopædias, in which they shared their parent's labors, these brothers have impressed their mark in both fields: the one, an extensive traveller and explorer from Alaska and Greenland to Mexico and the West Indies, a geologist, a naturalist who has written authoritatively on the subject of the distribution of animal life on the globe; the other, author of a paragon of an 'Historical Reference Book,' in which geography, history, and biography are reliably interwoven. Their collaboration insured for their own direct contributions the highest degree of accuracy, proportion and consistency. For what they let stand of the original work, they could hardly escape being secondarily responsible for some portion of errors or omissions.

The adherence to one volume is presumably to be charged to the publishers. Why, it may be asked, should not Lippincott's conform not only to the fashion of most cyclopædias and the major dictionaries, but of other gazetteers, like its German contemporary above cited? The reply may be that the single-volume condition really assisted the editors in the exercise of a severe self-restraint. The new edition is actually compressed, in spite of all additions, into 2,053 pages as against the 2,478 of the issue of 1880. The preface offers a capital summary of the changes effected, in the editorial aim to avoid "artificial standards" and the "weight of dead matter"—such as the obsolete tables of trade statistics excised from the notice of New York city, which has been reduced from three and a half pages to two and three-quarters. The article on Boston, rewritten *con amore*, has shrunken one-fifth; that on Philadelphia, one-third. Such gains permit the expansion of "Japan" by doubling, and of "Russia" by nearly one-half; and where the bulk remains the same, as in the case of the United States, room is made for such handy tables as the "Landmarks" in our history, with special reference to territorial development, and the chronology of the admission of States. Two minor examples of the trained judgment in reëditing may be cited, viz., Northampton, Mass., and the account of Chicago's great fire; nothing essential has been discarded, but the blue pencil has been at work. Sometimes, no doubt, the pencil works too automatically, as when the adjective is stricken out of the "*former* residence of Washington Irving" (under Irvington), as if he might be his own Rip Van Winkle.

The wonder is that in so huge a work the text throughout should be corrected or enlarged so close upon the date of publication, of which an easy test is the signing of the Treaty of Portsmouth, September 5, 1905—an event punctiliously commemorated under Japan, Portsmouth, and Russia. In petty matters, apart from the census returns, this was impossible. How know (or care!) that West Bethlehem, Pa., ceased to be a borough in 1904? But, under Bethlehem, Pa., the institutions of that historic town deserved more specific mention, particularly the girls' school, of changed name but long and honorable record; and why, by the way, the superfluous "*Christian* sect of the Moravians"? Under Cambridge, Mass., one might have expected to find mentioned among the more prominent buildings at least the Harvard Union and the Stadium, if not the Nelson Robinson, jr., [Architecture] Hall and the Phillips Brooks House. So, under Newark, N. J., the Prudential's building, one of the most successful, imposing, and ornamental structures among all the sky-scrapers of the New York metropolitan district, shines by its absence, and by the mention of a rival company's much inferior domicile. For such details a remedy could be found only by a very large sub-editorial organization, through which every American article might be submitted to local experts, just as 'Who's Who,' in renewing itself, sends out to every person recorded the previous statement for revision or addition.

Foreign topics are, of course, considered on a different scale, though Italian towns especially, down to the smallest, appear in numbers. Here the picturesque and historic element has appealed to cultured editors. They claim, and justly, that historical notices in a gazetteer must refer "largely" to changes of boundary, "vicissitudes of foreign domination," additions and subtractions by conquest, and the like. Largely, but not exclusively, unless a gazetteer is to be a mere commercial dictionary, occupied solely with numbers, whether of tons and dollars, or of living inhabitants. A touch of the past enlivens statistics of the present; and happily the historian has been allowed, within limits of reason, to mitigate the geographer's details. Many places once of note have here as elsewhere been lost to memory, at least under their old names; but it is gratifying to find the long and tangled lines of the counts of Mansfeld and Stolberg recalled, though in fewest words, in connection with the villages once the centres of their rule. The notice of Wismar ends: "It was in the possession of Sweden from 1648 to 1803." Space might have been spared to add that it was then mortgaged to the Duke of Mecklenburg-Schwerin as security for a million crowns borrowed by Gustavus IV. The interest accumulated till the debt was past paying, and in September, 1903, it was discharged by transference of the town. The historical section of the article "France" has been entirely rewritten, with an avoidance of bias or moralizing, and any one who compares it with the corresponding column in the edition of 1880 will receive a lesson in the art of lexicography.

Some divergences in past and present editing may be remarked. The practice, more or less thorough, of subjoining the name of the inhabitants of a given place or country, *e. g.*, Aragonese, Viennese, Florentine, Marseillais, Palermitan, Neapolitan, Madrilenian, etc., has been dropped. This we rather regret, though the space saved would have been more significant if the old practice had been thorough. More than twice as many initial Tch's occur in the alphabetic sequence as formerly, but Chinese names, like Chi-fu, are not tampered with; and, though we have Kamtchatka, the form Manchuria remains. This transliteration is reserved for Russian, Turkish and other West Asiatic names. The French diphthong *ou* is discarded in Abukir, Rumania, Rumelia, Seul, etc., and the *oo* of the earlier edition in Baku, Timbuktu (alternative Timbuctoo), etc. Dawson City, Johannesburg, Kimberley, Klondike, Oklahoma (one and a half columns), are brand-new titles. The Philippines are as good as new. For Ma-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nila, by the way, the alternative spelling Manilla is no longer recorded, though it represents the English pronunciation as "manee-la" does not. New, too, is Australia (the Commonwealth), with its brief outline of the Constitution of the Federation; and this observation on its antipodal neighbor (p. 1303): "In no other country of the world has state socialism and the participation of government in matters affecting labor and capital advanced with such strides as in New Zealand."

The new Ritter makes its appearance not a quarter century but a decade after its last edition, still under the direction of Johannes Penzler, and giving every evidence of an organized "institution." Its form and typography are preserved, but the 1,064 pages of this moiety in the eighth edition have become 1,248 in the ninth, notwithstanding a rigid elimination of matter deemed irrelevant to the main objects—to subserve industry and commerce in particular. Hence history cuts no figure whatever, and Japan, for all her recent military and political strenuosity, has no more space granted her than ten years ago, and her agriculture, fisheries, manufactures, and constitution in peace overshadow, for Ritter, her armaments afloat and ashore. Barely do we get two lines at the end predicting great changes in many respects as a result of peace with Russia; of the war itself otherwise not a word.

The inclusiveness of this Lexikon is naturally greatest for domestic use, and every place in Germany of 100 inhabitants and upwards is recorded. The scale then lowers to 150 for Austria and Switzerland, 200 to 500 for outstanding Europe, 500 to 1,000 for the remainder of the globe; but post-offices, telegraph and railroad stations, baths, and factories are liberally embraced irrespective of population. For example, the post hamlet Darkey Flats in Queensland, Australia, obtains bald mention (though Darkey Springs, Tenn., admissible by the same title, was too new or too invisible to be seized for the present edition). On the statistical side, the editor claims official information comparable in directness to that for which the 'Almanach de Gotha' annually makes its bow.

In point of fulness we have compared the American and the German dictionaries by counting a tract taken at random—Bushey-Buttel, just two pages of the latter, a little more of the former, with the resultant figures, excluding cross-references, of 112 places for Lippincott—reckoning in, however, the rubric *Bushmen*, not admissible to Ritter—and 310 for Ritter. Of these, making allowance for rough counting, the number of American names is the same in both volumes. Equally at random, as manifesting difference of methods, we subjoin two minor articles:

(Lippincott) "*Cholet* [pronunciation indicated, a cardinal feature of this work], a town of France, in Maine-et-Loire, on the Maine, 37 miles S. W. of Angers. It is the centre of a great textile manufacturing district. It figured in the wars of the Vendée. Pop. in 1901, 17,150."

This is fairly readable. Here is

(Ritter) "*Cholet*, 1) Arr. in Frankr., Dep. Maine-et-Loire . . . . 3) Hptst. [capital] ebd.; 19,352 E. (Population), P. T. [Post, Telegraph]. EdL [R. R. station] La Possonnière — Niort, Ch. — Clisson, Saumur—Ch. u, Nantes—Ch. [sundry lines]. Battist-, Leinen-, Calicots- u. Flanellweberei [textiles enumerated]."

This juxtaposition, with what has gone before, teaches that any one who can afford it must secure *both* these admirable works.

A Memoir of James Jackson, M.D. With Sketches of his Father and Mother, and Some Account of his Ancestry. By James Jackson Putnam, M.D. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1905. Pp. xii., 456.

The author of this work, a grandson of its subject, is heir not only of his blood, but of his professional acquirements and devotion. His work is a labor of love, and as such it must be viewed. Not that it need fear any criticism from outsiders, but only those can truly appreciate it who were to some degree within the charmed circle of Dr. Jackson's presence.

The first half of the book traces the line of the family from the earliest emigrants from England, sons of Christopher Jackson, and treats of various members of it, more especially Jonathan Jackson, an ardent and enterprising patriot of the Revolution, active in the Continental Congress and in the Federal party early in the nineteenth century. It tells the fortunes of his four sons, Dr. James Jackson's brothers, two of whom were shipmasters, one (Charles) prominent on the Supreme Bench of Massachusetts, and one (Patrick Tracy) a pioneer in the textile manufactures of Massachusetts. The father and all his sons made the strongest impression on their community for their intense activity of mind, their sterling probity, and their social charm. For many years they were associated with Newburyport, and later identified with Boston. The group of congenial families with which they were connected—Cabots, Lowells, Higginsons, and others—furnished much of the very lifeblood of Boston in the first half of the century just closed: *κ'οὔπω σφιν ἐξίτηλον αἷμα δαιμόνων*. This memorial is very valuable.

The second part is the memoir of Dr. James Jackson. This admirable man was born in 1777. He graduated from Harvard College in 1796; studied medicine with the venerable Dr. Holyoke; went to London in 1799 to "walk the hospitals," returning in 1800, when he immediately began practice. He was soon appointed professor in Harvard College; was instrumental in the successive foundation of various medical societies; was very active in the introduction of vaccination, and one of the founders of the Boston Medical School and the Massachusetts General Hospital, remaining in active practice for almost his entire life, not finally retiring till shortly before his death, which occurred in 1867. This is not what would be called an eventful or exceptional life; it is marked by no striking discoveries, nor, after the earliest years of practice, by professional controversies. Yet Dr. Jackson was a marked man, who made a profound impression upon his contemporaries, old and young, and the traditions of his temper, his character, and his wisdom will never die among Boston physicians. This he effected by a rare combination of qualities, preëminent among which was what one of his most intimate friends calls the "union of caution with boldness." He was never rash, and he was never timid. Having in his youth exerted himself with more than youthful energy to bring American medicine in line with the best science of the day, having shown by precept and example how much might be done to correct the excesses and errors of earlier practitioners, he was naturally conservative as he grew older. Yet his conservatism had no bigotry in it; it was simply the conviction of a vigorous mind that the old art had not yet been exhausted. His science and his experience were alike under the control of the most remarkable common sense—not that form of it which sometimes enables a comparatively untaught or inexperienced practitioner to atone for his deficiencies, but a controlling, imperial common sense, which saw into the very heart of the case, both for diagnosis and treatment, bringing to bear every circumstance with a penetration like Sherlock Holmes's. In the life of Prescott the historian it is recorded how Dr. Jackson, then a young physician, detected the signs of rheumatism where older physicians saw nothing of the kind, and the suspicion was in the end fully verified. A striking light is thrown on his philosophy of medicine by the comparison made between Andral and Louis in a letter to his son:

"I do not doubt that the former is the greater man—the latter would seem to be a statician or statistician. Though statistics are very valuable, yet we always find that a man who placed (*sic*) great reliance on them, in any branch of science, physical, moral, or political, is apt to make the mistake of thinking that two and two always make four—which they do not. That is, he applies mathematical reasoning to subjects which do not admit it."

It is hardly possible to overestimate the wisdom of this sentence.

No quality made its way more irresistibly into the very souls of all Dr. Jackson's associates than the attraction of his manner. It was not the fascination of a courtier, nor the artless charm of a child; it was an outgrowth of the deeply-rooted self-respect of a Christian, which obeys to the letter the precept, "Honor all men." How truly Dr. Jackson completed the commandment and loved the brotherhood, the letters in this volume abundantly show. It was above all in the sick room that his empire over man and nature—for this phrase, exaggerated as it seems, is none too strong—was most manifest. In copying Dr. Putnam's words, the writer of this review is only giving his own immediate personal reminiscences:

"In the sick room he became supreme, and certain it is that few physicians have ever brought to their task a keener instinct for the important points of the case, a finer sensitiveness for the needs of the patient, a more complete devotion to the art of enlisting sympathy, authority, and unconquerable hopefulness, of utilizing the sound of the voice and the expression of the face in the service of therapeutics. In the presence of his searching love of truth, his firmness, simplicity, earnestness, and directness, prevarication and petulance were disarmed, and the best instincts of nurse and patient alike were made to do willing duty."

There were physicians of Dr. Jackson's time whom the very thought of having in the house almost kept one well, from terror; the thought that he was to be sent for, almost made it a pleasure to be sick.

The last part of Dr. Putnam's memoir is chiefly given to correspondence with inti-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mate friends. These letters, though very precious to those within the inner circle, do not always make the successive steps in Dr. Jackson's later life as clear as might be desired to those outside. But one sad event comes forth in gloomy, yet the richest colors. Dr. Jackson's hopes were centred in his oldest son and namesake, who, after a brilliant career as a medical student in Paris, returned to take up the practice of his father's profession, but was carried off, in the year 1833, when less than twenty-four years old. The blow would have been crushing to a temper less firm than the father's; but the loss was not his alone. There is the most authoritative testimony, lasting down to the immediate present, that the death of this young man removed one who promised to be, both by his attainments and influence, the pioneer of a new era for American medicine. Dr. Jackson's circumstances obliged him to keep in active practice longer than his constitution and age seemed to sanction; he finally retired not many years before his death, which occurred on August 17, 1867.

Dr. Putnam's memoir is prepared with great good taste and modesty. The placing of a general estimate of its subject's character before instead of after the story of his life, is an interesting and perhaps a wise innovation. There is very little to provoke criticism. One singularly constructed sentence occurs on page 227, as to the acceptance of Jenner's discovery; and the compositor has gone astray in several proper names. Sewell for Sewall (p. 105), Stevenson for Stephenson (p. 146), *George* McNeil Whistler (p. 148), Abbot for Abbott (p. 161), Corea for Correa (pp. 253-4), Haywood for Hayward (p. 290), Eliot (Cabot) for Elliot (p. 398), and Chauncey for Chauncy (p. 398; elsewhere correct), are noticeable. Prof. John Gorham appears as John W. (p. 285) and John C. (p. 425). But such things are trifles. The book is a worthy memorial of one for whom the present writer may be allowed to borrow Ben Jonson's words: "I did love the man, and do honor his memory on this side idolatry."

With the Empress Dowager. By Katharine A. Carl. The Century Co. 1905.

Miss Carl must settle with her own conscience, even as she attempts in her introduction to vindicate to the public, the apparent violation of hospitality and confidence reposed in a guest who obtained access to the privacy of the Chinese Empress. Apart from this question in ethics, with which the purely literary reviewer has in strictness nothing to do, her book is a document of high value. It gives much detailed information of the sort which may satisfy the lover of gossip relating to forbidden interiors and to more or less shrouded personalities, but it does more: it offers not a little to the student of Korean and Japanese origins, and of those countries to which China was not only the Middle, but the model, kingdom; her court being "the glass of fashion and the mould of form."

To a scholar like the late Dean Stanley, the Pope as the representative of antique Christian customs was "a perfect museum of ecclesiastical curiosities." So also the occupant of China's throne explains in her or his dress many things odd and strange in the costume, only recently discarded, of the Mikado of Japan and the King of Korea. Incidentally, one may understand the native dislike of and even irritation at the use of the term "Mikado," instead of that generic term which is given to the Kaiser and Czar. Those who, remembering the Emperor of Dai Nippon in the days of his flowing robes and black cap with heaven-pointing gold "feather," recall his brightly colored clogs, or shoes, which raised him four or five inches above the earth, will read with interest Miss Carl's account of "six-inch-high stilt-like soles" which lift empress and princesses above ordinary mortals. To this day, whether visiting a horse race at Yokohama or riding through the streets of Tokio, the imperial Japanese inheritor of Chinese notions will not be looked upon from above by any mortal. The top seats of the grand stand must be vacated, and the second and third-story windows closed. Other items and details in Miss Carl's book show whence the chief rulers of the pupil nations around the Middle Kingdom derived their copy-book. The strata of costume and coiffure still surviving in the "related" or vassal states are indications, both chronological and otherwise, of early and extensive borrowings from the great model.

Miss Carl, however, is wise. Her book is all the more valuable because she does not transfer to her pages opinions or information borrowed from the writings of Sinologues, but gives her own impressions all the way through. The Empress Dowager is usually represented as an ogress to and by foreigners, and her reputed capacity for devouring Englishmen and other Europeans excels even the desire and ability of that blood-smelling gentleman of nursery lore who used to chant "Fee fo fum." Miss Carl's estimate of the character and womanhood of the chief lady of China is wholly different. Making all critical discount of the American's praise and appreciation, one can see here a genuine woman, who, besides being filled with a patriot's anxiety for her country and people, has shown uncommon ability. Having the old common-sense of the race, she was by her ministers declared a safer guide than the young palace-hermit who sat on the throne. She was called from her retirement when the Emperor became the tool of "reformers" who had other ideas in view than the good of China. Miss Carl's word-pictures of the Emperor and the princesses, besides being very interesting, throw much light upon the routine of life in the Forbidden City. While picturing on her pages the things delightful, she does not hesitate to show the uncanny aspects of Chinese life, even at court.

To the artist, the Empress was "the very embodiment of the Eternal Feminine. She was at once a child and a woman with strong virile qualities." After business with the statesmen, in the audience hall, transacting weighty affairs of state for three hours, she took a childish interest in the simplest pleasures, in flowers, dresses, and jewels. The festivities of the Court, the walks in the garden, the delights on the water, the palace customs, the summer and the winter days are pleasantly described. Yet the artist says little about the technique of her art, and why she painted so flat the picture which we saw at the St. Louis Exposition. Was it to please the lady who preferred the Chinese style? We outsiders cannot tell how much Miss Carl flattered the rather handsome and youngish-looking lady of well-nigh three-score years and ten, whose general dress and mode of wearing her hair, as well as face and features, are not violently different from those of European ladies. One must except always the (conventionalized) Chinese characters and the long nails of an adult lifetime's growth, to which we fear the taste of the Occident will never be reconciled.

Incidentally, the volume, which cannot boast of any special literary attractions, is a tremendous testimony to the power of peace-loving China to absorb into her social system such rude barbaric conquerors as rushed out of Mongolia and Mantchuria, and to make of these "horsey" militarists not only improvable races, but ultimately people that are hardly distinguishable from Chinese—a noble record. The book is worthy of what it has not, an index.

English Furniture. By Frederick S. Robinson. (The Connoisseur's Library.) London: Methuen & Co.; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1905. Pp. xl, 364. 160 illustrations.

This is one more of that very curious and interesting library of decorative art which is taking shape, and of which we have reviewed in these columns the volume on Ivories and that on Porcelain, by Alfred Maskell and Edward Dillon respectively. They are well-made books, and the charm of their "hand-made" paper, uncropped edges, and binding which allows of throwing open the volume, and which, on the whole, is comely, is a great help to the study of a subject that has everything to do with tasteful treatment and a generally attractive result. It is noticeable, however, that in the new volume, and apparently with the purpose of making the thick mass of text more perfect in its stitching, more flexible in the back, more easy to flip over with the thumb to find your place, the plates have been brought together at the close of the volume. The consequence is that, as we read, we are constantly referred to something we need to study, as to "another Lancashire chair, number 248 (Plate lviii.), with extremely similar top rail"; and that, with this, we are sent hunting through eighty leaves, each bearing a "plate" on either side numbered in rather small italic letters at the bottom. Then, as some of the plates are upright and others are oblong, the reader has to slew the book about from left to right and from right to left, that he may find and read those Roman numerals. Our reader may imagine the embarrassment and annoyance of all this, if he is really trying to follow the author in his careful exposition. The book would bear a higher price per copy if the plates all faced the same way, or if they were numbered at the top and in a uniform part of the page, or again if they were interspersed in the text as in the other volumes which we have examined belonging to this series.

Now as to the substance of the book, it is announced in the preface as expressly intended for the collector, and the very sensible remark is made that "a false idea of English furniture would be formed if a majority of the objects reproduced were such as are seldom or never found for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sale." On the other hand, the author has not hesitated to go to the Victoria and Albert Museum (viz., the South Kensington Museum, as Americans still know it best). Reproductions of Chippendale, Sheraton, and Heppelwhite books of examples have not been given, and that also is well. And indeed the pictures, all gelatine prints or such photo-process plates as may be approximately described by that name, are extremely attractive. One is gratified by finding so many unfamiliar types—cabinets, tall-boys, and settees, which represent the work of designers less often represented in our collections. A collection of 160 plates, containing at least twice that number of pieces of furniture, is worth anybody's while.

Of the twenty-five chapters, only one, seventeen pages long, is devoted to the whole mediæval period, except that chapter iii. deals with the "Early Oak Chests." It seems strange, but probably there is, of "furniture" properly so called, almost none in England of the period of Gothic architecture, or of the period which preceded that. Church furniture of the fixed and permanent sort, pulpits, and altar-screens, there is of course, and a very few examples of it are given; but it is evident that this is not the subject of the book we are considering. From the sixteenth century on, the theme is easy to pursue, for there is material for every decade of those four centuries. The list of illustrations which follows the contents is thirty pages long, and is a really valuable table of reference, giving, as it does, the dimensions of many of the pieces, and always the names of their owners, or the name of the church or museum in which each is preserved.

So much premised, it may be stated as a general truth that the book is written throughout with a strong personal character impressed upon it, as being the work of one who has collected or at least studied and gathered material on his own account. The reader gets to like the way in which uncertainty is expressed, for it argues knowledge when the limitations of that knowledge are sagaciously pointed out. As a correlative of this, the suppositions which are given as being suppositions and nothing else, are full of intelligence, and indeed the investigator who has not the power of conjecture at the right time will fail to arrive at interesting results. Have we not all read Tyndall on the use of the imagination in science? And is not the imagination, scientifically directed, of extreme importance in historical research? The only limitation which is required is instructed common sense. And so, as here is a large volume made up of minute items of discovery and of critical remark, it will be necessary to leave the reader with the assurance that he can hardly have a more sensible book on old furniture.

Military Studies. By Frederic Louis Huidekoper. Kansas City: Hudson Kimberly Co.

The author is on the whole justified in reprinting these studies, which appeared originally in military reviews. He would have been better advised, however, had he not included the one on Grouchy's operations in the Waterloo campaign, for its conclusions are at complete variance with present opinion, and he makes no reference to the best recent studies in France, England, and Germany, those of Houssaye, Kelly, Von Lettow Vorbeck and Pflugk-Harttung. It is entirely out of date to discuss Grouchy's disobedience of orders when it is well ascertained that, on the morning of Waterloo, Napoleon wrote approving his march on Wavre, and that only at 1:30 P. M., when the Prussian columns were already in sight, a dispatch was sent urging him to move by his left flank; that dispatch did not reach him until about 5:30. Grouchy's generalship was certainly far from brilliant; that of Napoleon was not, however, impeccable.

In his other studies, chiefly of the operations of Napoleon, Von Moltke, and Frederick, Mr. Huidekoper appears to better advantage. He is evidently a keen student of this extremely difficult branch of historical work, and deserves encouragement. There are, however, occasional inaccuracies; thus, in the essay in which he deals with Mars-la-Tour, Vionville, and Jena, the following corrections of detail are necessary: at page 56 for Verdun read Werden; at page 59 it is said that from the Würzburg-Nuremberg line Napoleon could have marched against the Prussians via Mainz and Wesel; assuredly, but he could also at that rate have marched through Antwerp and Hamburg; at page 64 the French word *avis*, in an order of Berthier, is translated *advice;* it should be *information*—a very important difference in a military order.

On larger questions, especially of strategy, the author often fails to carry conviction; but, after all, strategy is always a process of disagreements, from the initial one of the opposing generals to the never final one of contending historians. Yet a clear consensus of opinion is against Mr. Huidekoper in such dicta as the following: "No one has yet succeeded in refuting the maxim that the fundamental principles of strategy always have been and always will be immutable"; or again, when he declares: "The immutable principles which must be observed are (1) to keep one's forces united, (2) not to be vulnerable on any point. . . ." It is just this attitude towards strategy that the greatest masters—theorists like Clausewitz and Henderson, practicians like Lee and Jackson—have rejected. If rules were immutable, war would not be a game of chance; if strategy did not depend on a fluctuating factor, which is the mind and courage of an opponent, Lee could not have shown strategy at the Second Manassas and Chancellorsville, but only fortunate ineptitude. "Strategical principles," says Henderson, "are neither to be rigidly applied nor overscrupulously respected; they are to be obeyed rather in the spirit than in the letter." Further work from Mr. Huidekoper in the same field may be looked forward to with interest.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Avery, Elroy McKendree. A History of the United States and its People. Vol. 2. Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers Co.
Bartlett, Albert Le Roy, and Howard Lee McBain. The Elements of English Grammar. Silver, Burdett & Co.
Carter, Jesse Benedict. The Religion of Numa. Macmillan Co. $1.
Devine, Edward T. Efficiency and Relief. Macmillan Co. 75 cents.
Etchings of Charles Méryon. Imported by Scribners. $2.50 net.
Fitzsimmons, Orlando K. Metamorphose. Buffalo: Progress Publishing Association. $2.
Graham, Winifred. The Vision at the Savoy. Fleming H. Revell Co.
Henderson, Ernest F. A Short History of Germany. Macmillan Co. $2.50 net.
Jowett, J. H. The Epistles of St. Peter. A. C. Armstrong & Son. $1.25.
Laking, Guy Francis. The Furniture of Windsor Castle. Dutton. $35 net.
Laycock, Craven, and Robert L. Scales. Argumentation and Debate. Macmillan Co. 60 cents.
Maclean, Frank. Henry Moore. Imported by Scribners. $1.25 net.
Merzbacher, Gottfried. The Central Tian-Shan Mountains. Dutton. $3.50 net.
Nodier, Charles. Jean Sbogar. Henry Frowde.
Orr, James. The Problem of the Old Testament. Scribners. $1.50 net.
Palgrave's Golden Treasury. Edited by Herbert Bates. Longmans. 40 cents.
Redway, Jacques Wardlaw. The Making of the American Nation. Silver, Burdett & Co. $1.
Reinach, Salomon. Cults, Mythes et Religions. Vol. 2. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
Religion of Christ in the Twentieth Century, The. Putnams. $1.50.
Rickett, Leonard A. Poems of Love and Nature. Longmans. $1.25 net.
Santayana, George. The Life of Reason. Scribners. $1.25 net.
Schultze, Arthur. Advanced Algebra. Macmillan Co. $1.25.
Shakspere's Twelfth Night. Edited by John B. Henneman. Longmans. 40 cents.
Spenser, Edmund. The Faerie Queene. Caxton Thin Paper Series. 2 vols. Imported by Scribners. $2.50 net.
Spenser's Faerie Queene. Edited by John Erskine. Longmans. 40 cents.
Tapp, Sidney C. The Struggle. A. Wessels Co.
Tarnowski, Stanislas. Chopin: As Revealed by Extracts from his Diary. Imported by Scribners. $1 net.
Taylor, I. A. The Life of Queen Henrietta Maria. 2 vols. Dutton. $7.50 net.
Tennyson's In Memoriam. Annotated by the Author. Macmillan. $1.
Thread of Gold, The. Dutton. $3 net.
Titian, The Later Works of. Frederick Warne & Co. $1.25.
Underhill, Evelyn. The Miracles of Our Lady Saint Mary. Dutton. $2 net.
Warman, Cy. The Last Spike. Scribners. $1.25.
Watson, John. The Inspiration of Our Faith. A. C. Armstrong & Son. $1.25 net.
Whipple, Leander Edmund. Mental Healing. The Metaphysical Publishing Co. $1.50.
Whitney, W. D., and C. R. Lanman. Atharva-Veda Sanhita. (Harvard Oriental Series, vols. viii., viii.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University.
Who's Who in America, 1906-1907. Chicago: A. N. Marquis & Co. $3.50.
Who's Who, 1906. Macmillan Co.
Wilson-Barrett, Alfred. The Silver Pin. Akron, O.: The Saalfield Publishing Co. $1.50.
Yglesias, H. R. Figure Skating. Dutton. 50 cents.

"A more delightful volume of criticism it would be hard to find," says the *Boston Transcript* of

Stopford Brooke: On Ten Plays of Shakespeare

$2.25 net. By mail $2.37.

Henry Holt & Co. 29 W. 23d St. New York

DEFINITE OFFERS OF BOOKS and Periodicals solicited by A. S. CLARK, Peekskill, N. Y.

JUST PUBLISHED

The Principles of Religious Ceremonial

By the Rev. WALTER HOWARD FRERE, M. A., of the Community of the Resurrection. Crown 8vo. $1.40 net. (*Oxford Library.*)

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., New York

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT Says that Owen Wister's Life of Gen. Grant in the Beacon Biographies "is the best brief biography ever written of any prominent American." Every one should read it. Postpaid 75 cts.

SMALL, MAYNARD & COMPANY
31 Arrow Street Cambridge, Mass.

LITERARY CRITICISM Of English and American Authors. 680 to 1905. In eight royal 8vo volumes. 6,000 pages.
Descriptive matter and specimen pages on request.
MOULTON PUBLISHING CO., Buffalo, New York.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED